

I/III/III

1998 NCAA
CONVENTION
PROCEEDINGS

92nd Annual Convention

January 10-13, 1998

Atlanta, Georgia

PROCEEDINGS

1998 NCAA CONVENTION PROCEEDINGS

92nd Annual Convention

January 10-13, 1998

Atlanta, Georgia

PROCEEDINGS



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

6201 College Boulevard
Overland Park, Kansas 66211-2422
913/339-1906
<http://www.ncaa.org>

May 1998

Edited By: Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing.*
Type/Layout: Karen S. Larsen, *Graphics Technician.*

Distributed to chief executive officers, conference commissioners, affiliated and corresponding members.

NCAA, NCAA logo and NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION are registered marks of the Association and use in any manner is prohibited unless prior approval is obtained from the Association.

■ Table of Contents

I. REGISTER 1998

Governance Structure	6
Convention Delegates, Visitors, Working Media	16

II. PROCEEDINGS OF THE 92ND NCAA CONVENTION

Opening Business Session	39
Opening Remarks	39
Report of Memorial Resolutions Committee	40
State of the Association Address	42
NCAA Honors Dinner	48
Welcome	48
Invocation	48
Introductions	48
Today's Top VII	49
Silver Anniversary Honorees	55
Award of Valor	59
Theodore Roosevelt Award	61
Benediction	64
Division I Business Session	65
Opening Remarks	65
Keynote Address	65
Division II Business Session	76
Opening Remarks	76
Presidents Council Report	78
Management Council Report	79
Proposed Amendments	82
Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees (No. 1)	82
Gambling Activities (No. 2)	83
Financial Aid—Pell Grants—Division II (No. 3)	84
Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits—	
Institutions That Sponsor Cross Country	
But Do Not Sponsor Track (No. 4)	84
Financial Aid—Division II Maximum	
Equivalency Limits—Football (No. 6)	86
Playing and Practice Seasons—Spring Practice—	
Division II Football (No. 7)	92
Financial Aid—Pell Grants—Division II (No. 3)	94
Educational Expenses—	
National Governing Bodies (No. 8)	94
De Minimis Violations—Prospective and	
Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 9)	95
Eligibility—Restitution for Receipt of	
Improper Benefit (No. 10)	96
Eligibility—Joint College/High-School Program (No. 11)	96
Eligibility—One-Time Transfer Exception—	
Division II (No. 12)	97

Playing and Practice Seasons—Division II Basketball— Annual Exemptions (No. 13)	100
Playing and Practice Seasons—Division II Basketball— Annual Exemptions (No. 14)	100
Playing and Practice Seasons—Swimming and Diving (No. 15)	100
Tryouts—Enrolled Students (No. 16)	101
Enforcement—Penalties for Secondary Violations (No. 17)	101
NCAA Core-Course Review Committee (No. 18)	102
Division II Men's and Women's Tennis Committee (No. 19)	102
Forums	103
Championships	103
Continuation of Division II Business Session	123
Opening Remarks	123
Forums	123
Budget and Finance	123
Age-Based Participation	127
Academic Requirements	132
Rule Simplification and Deregulation	142
Closing Remarks	143
Division III Business Session	147
Opening Remarks	147
Presidents Council Report	149
Management Council Report	151
Proposed Amendments	153
Gambling Activities (No. 20)	153
Maximum Dates of Competition—Women's Lacrosse— Division III (No. 22)	154
Expenses for Participation in Olympic Exhibitions (No. 23)	156
Eligibility—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefit (No. 24)	156
De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes (No. 25)	157
Membership Reclassification—Division III (No. 26)	157
Budget Committee Report	158
Strategic Planning Discussion	159
Committee Reports	162
Infractions Subcommittee	163
Student-Athlete Reinstatement Subcommittee	163
Interpretations and Legislation	164
Membership	164
Nominating	166
Student-Athlete Advisory	168
Association-Wide	169
Forums	170
Championships	195
Automatic Qualification	207
Title IX and Gender Equity	220
Financial Aid	239
Nominating Committee	239
Closing Remarks	239

III. APPENDICES

A. Legislative Proposals	A-1
B. Roll-Call Votes	A-35
C. Past Convention Sites	A-40
D. NCAA Officers, 1906-1998	A-43

NCAA Governance Structure

Executive Committee

(20 members)

Chair—Samuel H. Smith

DIVISION I

Name	Institution	Term Expires
George Dennison	University of Montana	Jan. 2000 *
Anthony J. DiGiorgio	Winthrop University	Jan. 1999 #
Carol C. Harter	University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Jan. 2001 *
William E. Kirwan	University of Maryland, College Park	Jan. 1998
V. Lane Rawlins	University of Memphis	Jan. 1998
Bro. Thomas J. Scanlan	Manhattan College	Jan. 1999 #
Eleanor B. Schwartz	University of Missouri, Kansas City	Jan. 2000 *
Kenneth A. Shaw	Syracuse University	Jan. 1999
Samuel H. Smith	Washington State University	Jan. 1999
Graham B. Spanier	Pennsylvania State University	Jan. 2000 *
Charles Wethington Jr.	University of Kentucky	Jan. 2000 *
**Carol A. Cartwright/ Milton A. Gordon	Kent State University/California State University, Fullerton	Jan. 1999

DIVISION II

Anthony F. Ceddia	Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania	Aug. 1998 *
Adam W. Herbert	University of North Florida	Jan. 1999 *

DIVISION III

Lois B. DeFleur	State University of New York at Binghamton	Jan. 1998 *
Curtis L. McCray	Millikin University	Jan. 2001 *

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL CHAIRS

(Ex officio, nonvoting members)

Division I: Robert A. Bowlsby, University of Iowa, Jan. 1999*

Division II: Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University, Jan. 1999*

Division III: Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, Jan. 1998*

Executive Director: Cedric W. Dempsey

Note: The NCAA executive director votes only in the case of tie votes among the other voting members.

NCAA staff liaison:

Keith E. Martin

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection) to the Executive Committee.

#Not eligible for reselection by virtue of conference no longer having a seat on Board of Directors.

**Note: Either President Cartwright or President Gordon will be involved in each meeting, but not both.

Division I Board of Directors

(15 members)

Chair—Kenneth A. Shaw

DIVISION I-A

Conference Represented	Name, Institution	Term Expires
Atlantic Coast	William E. Kirwan, University of Maryland, College Park	Jan. 2002 *
Big East	Kenneth A. Shaw, Syracuse University	Jan. 1999
Big Ten	Graham B. Spanier, Pennsylvania State University	Jan. 2000 *
Big 12	James E. Halligan, Oklahoma State University	Jan. 2001 *
Conference USA	V. Lane Rawlins, University of Memphis	Jan. 2002 *
Pacific-10	Samuel H. Smith, Washington State University	Jan. 1999
Southeastern	Charles Wethington Jr., University of Kentucky	Jan. 2000 *
Western Athletic	Carol C. Harter, University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Jan. 2001 *
MAC/Big West ¹	Carol A. Cartwright, Kent State University/ Milton A. Gordon, California State University, Fullerton	Jan. 1999

DIVISION I-AA AND I-AAA

Big Sky	George M. Dennison, University of Montana	Jan. 2000 *
Big South	Anthony J. DiGiorgio, Winthrop University	Jan. 1999 #
Metro Atlantic	Bro. Thomas J. Scanlan, Manhattan College	Jan. 1999 #
Mid-Continent	Eleanor B. Schwartz, University of Missouri, Kansas City	Jan. 2000 *
Mid-Eastern Athletic	Edward B. Fort, North Carolina A&T State University	Jan. 2001 *
West Coast	Rev. David T. Tyson, University of Portland	Jan. 2001 *

NCAA staff liaisons:

Stephen R. Morgan

Robin J. Green

Division I Management Council

(34 members)

Chair—Robert A. Bowlsby

DIVISION I-A

Conference Represented	Name, Institution	Term Expires
Atlantic Coast	Arthur W. Cooper, North Carolina State University	Jan. 1999
Atlantic Coast	Deborah A. Yow, University of Maryland, College Park	Jan. 2001

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection).

¹Only one individual will attend and participate in each meeting of the Board.

#Not eligible for reselection by virtue of conference no longer having seat.

*Conference
Represented*

Big East	Carol J. Sprague, University of Pittsburgh	Jan. 1999
Big East	Gene DeFilippo, Boston College	Jan. 2001*
Big Ten	Percy Bates, University of Michigan	Jan. 1999
Big Ten	Robert A. Bowlsby, University of Iowa	Jan. 2001*
Big 12	David M. Guinn, Baylor University	Jan. 1999
Big 12	Eugene D. Smith, Iowa State University	Jan. 2001*
Conference USA	Michael L. Slive, Conference USA	Jan. 1998
Conference USA	Nancy R. Hamant, University of Cincinnati	Jan. 2000*
Pacific-10	Edward "Ted" Leland, Stanford University	Jan. 1998
Pacific-10	Kathleen LaRose, University of Arizona	Jan. 2000*
Southeastern	Joan C. Cronan, University of Tennessee, Knoxville	Jan. 2000*
Southeastern	Jeremy N. Foley, University of Florida	Jan. 1998
Western Athletic	Charles Whitcomb, San Jose State University	Jan. 2000*
Western Athletic	W. James Copeland Jr., Southern Methodist University	Jan. 1998
MAC	Andrea Seger, Ball State University	Jan. 2001*
Big West	To be determined	Jan. 1999

DIVISION I-AA AND I-AAA

*Conference
Represented*

America East	Edgar N. Johnson, University of Delaware	Jan. 1998
Atlantic 10	Linda Bruno, Atlantic 10 Conference	Jan. 2001*
Colonial Athletic	James Jarrett, Old Dominion University	Jan. 2000*
Ivy Group	Jeffrey H. Orleans, Ivy Group	Jan. 1999#
Midwestern Collegiate	John C. Parry, Butler University	Jan. 1999#
Missouri Valley	Charlotte West, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale	Jan. 2001*
Northeast	Marilyn A. McNeil, Monmouth University (New Jersey)	Jan. 1998
Ohio Valley	Richard A. McDuffie, Eastern Illinois University	Jan. 2000*
Patriot League	Constance H. Hurlbut, Patriot League	Jan. 2000*
Southern	Alan Hauser, Appalachian State University	Jan. 2001*
Southland	Gregory Sankey, Southland Conference	Jan. 2001*
Southwestern Athletic	James Frank, Southwestern Athletic Conference	Jan. 1999
Sun Belt	Richard M. Mello, University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Jan. 1999
Trans America	Orby Moss Jr., Georgia State University	Jan. 2000*
At-Large I-AA	Kelly Patton-Woodward, Northern Arizona University	Jan. 1998
At-Large I-AAA	To be determined	Jan. 1999

NCAA staff liaisons:

Stephen R. Morgan
Robin J. Green

*Not eligible for reappointment (or reselection).

#Not eligible for reselection by virtue of conference no longer having seat.

Division II Presidents Council

(13 members)

Chair—Adam W. Herbert

<i>Region</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Region 1	Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, vice-chair	Jan. 1999*
Region 1	Jessica S. Kozloff, Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 2001*
Region 2	Robert A. Burnett, Armstrong Atlantic State University	Jan. 2000*
Region 2	Adam W. Herbert, University of North Florida	Jan. 1999*
Region 2	Jerry E. McGee, Wingate University	Jan. 2001*
Region 2	Oscar L. Prater, Fort Valley State University	Jan. 2002*
Region 3	Arend D. Lubbers, Grand Valley State University	Jan. 1999
Region 3	Albert J. Shannon, St. Joseph's College (Indiana)	Jan. 2001*
Region 4	Charles D. Dunn, Henderson State University	Jan. 2001*
Region 4	Marvalene Hughes, California State University, Stanislaus	Jan. 2000*
Region 4	Joan K. Wadlow, University of Alaska Fairbanks	Jan. 2002*
At large	Gladys Styles Johnston, University of Nebraska at Kearney	Jan. 2002*
At large	Allen Lee Sessoms, Queens College (New York)	Jan. 2000*

NCAA staff liaisons:

Nancy L. Mitchell

Mike L. Racy

Division II Management Council

(24 members)

Chair—Lynn L. Dorn

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
California	Carol M. Dunn, California State University, Los Angeles	Jan. 2000*
Collegiate		Jan. 1998
Carolinas-Virginia	Kaye P. Crook, Coker College	Jan. 2001*
Central Intercollegiate Athletic	Alfreeda Goff, Virginia State University	Jan. 2001*
Great Lakes		
Intercollegiate Athletic	Robert T. Becker, Saginaw Valley State University	Jan. 1999*
Great Lakes Valley	David P. O'Toole, Bellarmine College	Jan. 1998*
Gulf South	Milton L. Bradley, Delta State University	Jan. 1999
Lone Star	Margaret Harbison, Texas A&M University, Commerce	Jan. 1999
Mid-America		
Intercollegiate Athletic	Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University	Jan. 1998
New England Collegiate	Lawrence E. Fitzgerald, Southern Connecticut State University	Jan. 2001*

*Not eligible for reappointment.

<i>Conference Represented</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
New York Collegiate Athletic North Central	Thomas R. Shirley, Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science	Jan. 2001*
Intercollegiate Athletic	Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University	Jan. 1999*
Northeast 10	Linda C. Hackett, Bryant College	Jan. 2000*
Northern California Athletic	Pam Gill-Fisher, University of California, Davis	Jan. 1998
Northern Sun	Patricia Merrier, University of Minnesota, Duluth	Jan. 2000*
Peach Belt Athletic	Clint Bryant, Augusta State University, vice-chair	Jan. 1999
Pennsylvania State Athletic	Marjorie A. Trout, Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 2000*
Rocky Mountain Athletic	Barbara J. Schroeder, Regis University (Colorado)	Jan. 2001*
South Atlantic Southern	Doug Echols, South Atlantic Conference	Jan. 1999
Intercollegiate Athletic	Wil G. Shaw, Morehouse College	Jan. 2000*
Sunshine State	G. Jean Cerra, Barry University	Jan. 2000*
West Virginia		
Intercollegiate Athletic	James W. Watson, West Liberty State College	Jan. 2001*
Independent	Timothy J. Dillon, University of Alaska Anchorage	Jan. 2001*
At Large	Peggy L. Green, Fayetteville State University	Jan. 1998
At Large	Earl W. Edwards, East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	Jan. 2002*

Appointed to take office January 15, 1998:

Great Lakes Valley	Kenneth Borden, University of Indianapolis	Jan. 2002*
--------------------	--	------------

NCAA staff liaisons:

Nancy L. Mitchell
Mike L. Racy

*Not eligible for reappointment.

Division III Presidents Council

(11 members)

Chair—Curtis L. McCray

<i>Region</i>	<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
Region 1	John DiBiaggio, Tufts University	Jan. 2001*
Region 1	Gordon A. Haaland, Gettysburg College	Jan. 2000*
Region 2	Lois B. DeFleur, State University of New York at Binghamton, vice-chair	Jan. 1998*
Region 2	Robert W. Neff, Juniata College	Jan. 2000*
Region 3	David L. Beckley, Rust College	Jan. 1999*
Region 3	Ann H. Die, Hendrix College	Jan. 2001*
Region 4	Judith L. Kuipers, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse	Jan. 1999*
Region 4	Curtis L. McCray, Millikin University	Jan. 2001*
At Large	L. Jay Oliva, New York University	Jan. 1998*
At Large	Gloria Scott, Bennett College	Jan. 1999
At Large	Judson Taylor, State University of New York at Cortland	Jan. 2000*

NCAA staff liaisons:

Daniel T. Dutcher

Bridget Belgiovine (as of January 14, 1998)

Division III Management Council

(19 members)

Chair—Bridget Belgiovine

<i>Name, Institution</i>	<i>Term Expires</i>
James R. Appleton, University of Redlands	Jan. 1998*
Albert D. Bean Jr., University of Southern Maine	Jan. 1999*
Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse	Jan. 1998*
John S. Biddiscombe, Wesleyan University (Connecticut)	Jan. 2000*
Stanley P. Caine, Adrian College, vice-chair	Jan. 1999*
Lynda J. Calkins, Hollins College	Jan. 2000*
Carlyle Carter, Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	Jan. 2000*
Mary Jo Gunning, Marywood University	Jan. 1999*
Maureen Hager, Allegheny College	Jan. 1999*
Linda E. Hopple, Middle Atlantic States Conference	Jan. 1998*
Walter J. Johnson, North Central College	Jan. 2001*
Linda S. Moulton, Clark University (Massachusetts)	Jan. 1998*
Louise O'Neal, Wellesley College	Jan. 2001*
Richard A. Rasmussen, University Athletic Association	Jan. 1999*
Ginny Studer, State University College at Brockport	Jan. 2000*
Truman D. Turnquist, Mount Union College	Jan. 2001*
Robert E. Williams, Swarthmore College	Jan. 1998*
#Kerry Gotham, Nazareth College	Jan. 2000*
#Christy Wilson, Nebraska Wesleyan University	Jan. 1999*

NCAA staff liaisons:

Daniel T. Dutcher

Bridget Belgiovine (as of January 14, 1998)

*Not eligible for reappointment.

#Student-Athlete Advisory Committee representative.

NCAA National Office Staff

Executive Team

Cedric W. Dempsey, *Executive Director*
Daniel Boggan Jr., *Chief Operating Officer*
Thomas W. Jernstedt, *Deputy Executive Director*

Governance Structure Team

Stephen R. Morgan, *Chief of Staff for Division I*
Nancy L. Mitchell, *Chief of Staff for Division II*
Daniel T. Dutcher, *Chief of Staff for Division III*
Robin J. Green, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division I*
Mike L. Racy, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division II*
Bridget Belgiovine, *Assistant Chief of Staff for Division III*
Julie M. Quickel, *Committee Coordinator*

Executive Affairs

Louis J. Spry, *Associate Executive Director*
Lydia L. Sanchez, *Director of Executive Affairs*

Championships Group

Tricia Bork, *Group Executive Director for Championships*
Daniel A. Calandro, *Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, Operations*
William R. Hancock, *Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, Administration*
James A. Marchiony, *Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship, Media*
Donna J. Noonan, *Director of Championships*
Dennis L. Poppe, *Director of Championships*
R. Wayne Burrow, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Philip A. Buttafuoco, *Senior Assistant Director of Championships*
Carl E. Daniels, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Thomas A. Jacobs, *Senior Assistant Director of Championships*
Bernard M. Muir, *Assistant Director of the Division I Men's Basketball Championship*
Timothy N. Pavlechko, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Christine M. Pohl, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Michelle A. Pond, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Cindy Smith, *Assistant Director of Championships*
Stann Tate, *Assistant Director of Championships*

Education Services Group

Ronald J. Stratten, *Group Executive Director for Education Services*
Stanley D. Johnson, *Director of Professional Development*
Janet M. Justus, *Director of Education Outreach*
Edward A. Thiebe, *Director of Youth Programs*
Frank D. Uryasz, *Director of Sports Sciences*
Ursula R. Walsh, *Director of Research*
Elizabeth N. Binkley, *Sports Sciences Program Coordinator*
Sharon K. Cessna, *Senior Youth Programs Coordinator*

Timothy M. Clark, *Youth Programs Coordinator*
Rochelle M. Collins, *Senior Youth Programs Coordinator*
Randall W. Dick, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
Todd A. Petr, *Senior Assistant Director of Research*
Cindy A. Thomas, *Assistant Director of Sports Sciences*
Lori A. Hendricks, *Education Outreach Program Coordinator*

Enforcement and Student-Athlete Reinstatement Group

S. David Berst, *Group Executive Director for Enforcement and Student-Athlete Reinstatement*
Carrie A. Doyle, *Director of Student-Athlete Reinstatement*
Richard R. Hilliard, *Director of Enforcement*
Mark P. Jones, *Director of Enforcement*
Charles E. Smrt, *Director of Enforcement*
Dirk L. Taitt, *Director of Enforcement*
Jan A. Brown, *Enforcement Representative*
John T. Cochrane, *Enforcement Representative*
Shepard C. Cooper, *Enforcement Representative*
W. Derrick Crawford, *Enforcement Representative*
Melisa A. Dehon, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Kevin R. Fite, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Jeffrey D. Freedman, *Enforcement Representative*
Cynthia J. Gabel, *Enforcement Representative II*
Jan R. Gentry, *Enforcement Representative*
Stephanie J. Hannah, *Enforcement Representative*
Karl P. Hicks, *Enforcement Representative*
Thomas C. Hosty, *Enforcement Representative*
Charles A. Jones, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*
Edward B. Lupomech, *Enforcement Representative*
Les J. Pico, *Enforcement Representative*
William S. Saum, *Agent and Gambling Representative II*
Cristie A. Sexton, *Enforcement Representative*
Jennifer S. Vallo, *Student-Athlete Reinstatement Representative*

Finance and Information Services Group

To be appointed, *Group Executive Director for Finance and Information Services*
Keith E. Martin, *Director of Finance and Business Operations*
Daniel W. Spencer, *Director of Information Systems and Technology*
Karren L. Bishop, *Programmer / Analyst*
Sarah T. Bobert, *Accounting Manager II*
Dean I. Dautenhahn, *Programmer / Analyst*
William C. Foreman, *Manager of Technical Services*
Marla B. Gleason, *Operations Manager*
Richard W. Hanson, *Programmer / Analyst*
Jeffrey L. Hayden, *Pilot*
Rachelle L. Hooks, *Programmer / Analyst*
Lynette R. Morasch, *Accounting Manager II*
Marketing, Licensing and Promotions Group
C. Dennis Cryder, *Group Executive Director for Marketing, Licensing and Promotions*

Angie Lovett, *Director of Licensing*
 Will J. Rudd, *Director of the Hall of Champions*
 Alfred B. White, *Director of Promotions*
 Laurie Bollig, *Assistant Director of Special Events*
 Jeffery S. Hiller, *Senior Assistant Director of the Hall of Champions*
 Kirby P. Hocutt, *Licensing Coordinator*
 Timothy S. Lynde, *Manager of Corporate Marketing*
 Emily J. Lyons, *Manager of Corporate Marketing*
 Rose Ann Martinez, *Manager of Corporate Marketing*
 Lisa Turner, *Assistant Director of Special Events*
 Cynthia M. Van Matre, *Assistant Director of Promotions*

Membership Services Group

John H. Leavens, *Group Executive Director for Membership Services*
 David A. Knopp, *Director of Membership Services*
 Kevin C. Lennon, *Director of Membership Services*
 Stephen A. Mallonee, *Director of Membership Services*
 Robert A. Oliver, *Director of Membership Services*
 Athena Yiamouyiannis, *Director of Membership Services*
 Douglas I. Archie, *Membership Services Representative*
 Troy L. Arthur, *Membership Services Representative*
 Rebecca G. Bowman, *Coordinator of Athletics Certification II*
 Patrick L. Britz, *Membership Services Representative*
 David R. Brunk, *Membership Services Representative*
 Carolyn M. Claude, *Membership Services Representative*
 Mira J. Colman, *Membership Services Assistant*
 Kristen L. Davis, *Membership Services Assistant*
 Diane E. Dickman, *Coordinator of Initial Eligibility/
 Core-Course Review II*
 Allison Freedman, *Membership Services Representative*
 Keith A. Gill, *Membership Services Representative*
 Philip D. Grayson, *Membership Services Representative*
 Carrie A. Hagwell, *Coordinator of Athletics Certification II*
 Carolayne E. Henry, *Coordinator of Education II*
 Jennifer L. Heppel, *Membership Services Representative*
 Lynn M. Holzman, *Membership Services Representative*
 James R. Johnson, *Membership Services Representative*
 Stacey F. Karpinski, *Coordinator of Initial-Eligibility Waivers II*
 Shane Lyons, *Coordinator of Interpretations II*
 Donna M. Mabry, *Membership Services Representative*
 Elizabeth Muir, *Membership Services Representative*
 Israel Negron, *Membership Services Representative*
 Delise S. O'Meally, *Membership Services Representative*
 Richard C. Perko, *Membership Services Representative*
 N. Bea Pray, *Membership Services Representative*
 David W. Schnase, *Coordinator of Legislation II*
 Robert W. Thomas, *Membership Services Representative*

Public Affairs Group

Celeste E. Rose, *Group Executive Director for Public Affairs*
 Doris A. Dixon, *Director of Federal Relations, One Dupont Circle, N.W.,
 Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202/293-3050*

Michael V. Earle, *Director of Publishing*
 Regina L. McNeal-Smith, *Interim Director of Broadcast Services*
 David Pickle, *Editor-in-Chief, The NCAA News*
 Wallace I. Renfro, *Director of Public Relations*
 Vic Royal, *Director of Graphics*
 Jim Wright, *Director of Statistics*
 Vanessa L. Abell, *Publications Editor*
 Marty Benson, *Publications Editor*
 Theodore A. Breidenthal, *Publications Editor*
 Gary T. Brown, *Assistant Director of Publishing*
 Richard M. Campbell, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Jack L. Copeland, *Senior Managing Editor, The NCAA News*
 Wayne Davis, *Senior Graphics Designer*
 Chris Farrow, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*
 Kimberly A. Dickson, *Public Information Administrator*
 Stephen R. Hagwell, *Publications Editor*
 Shawna L. Hansen, *Publications Editor*
 Gary K. Johnson, *Senior Statistics Coordinator*
 Daniel A. Nestel, *Assistant Director of Federal Relations*
 Lee Newman, *Publications Production Manager*
 John Painter, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Jenifer Scheibler, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Ronald Schwartz, *Director, Television News Service, 119 West 57th
 Street, Suite 1212, New York, N.Y. 10019; 212/541-8840*
 Kathy A. Short, *Circulation Manager*
 Sean Straziscar, *Statistics Coordinator*
 Marcia Stubbeman, *Assistant Editor, The NCAA News*
 Jill Sutton, *Assistant Director of Broadcast Services*
 Teri Wolfgang, *Senior Graphic Designer*

■ 92nd Annual Convention Delegates and Visitors

Active Member Institutions

Abilene Christian University: Sylvia Dyer, Stan D. Lambert, David B. Merrell,
Royce Money, Jack Rich
Adams State College: Tom Gilmore
Adelphi University: Robert E. Hartwell
Adrian College: Stanley P. Caine, C. Henry Mensing
Agnes Scott College: Gue' P. Hudson, A. Page Remillard
Akron, University of: Michael A. Bobinski, David Jamison, Dawn Rogers,
Marion A. Ruebel
Alabama, University of, at Birmingham: Maureen "Mo" Harbin, Rose Scripa
Alabama, University of, Huntsville: James E. Harris, Clyde Riley, Michael
Scarano
Alabama, University of, Tuscaloosa: Robert Bockrath, Meredith P. Willard
Alabama A&M University: Henry Darlington
Alabama State University: W. Curtis Williams
Alaska Anchorage, University of: Dede Allen, Timothy J. Dillon
Alaska Fairbanks, University of: Kelly J. Higgins, Karen L. Jones, Gerald
Shields, Joan K. Wadlow
Albany, University at: Gail Cummings-Danson, Milton E. Richards
Albany State College (Georgia): Craig B. Curry
Albertus Magnus College: Joseph A. Tonelli
Albion College: Jim Conway
Albright College: Ellen S. Hurwitz, Stan Hyman, Sally A. Stetler
Alcorn State University: Clinton Bristow Jr., Norris Allen Edney, Lloyd N.
Hill, Robert H. J. Raines
Alderson-Broaddus College: Paul A. Bennett
Alfred University: Edward G. Coll Jr., Karen L. Johnson, James Moretti
Allegheny College: Richard A. Creehan, Maureen Hager
Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales: Joy M. Richman
Alma College: Denny Griffin
Alvernia College: Adam Hertz, Sandra Slabik
American International College: Robert E. Burke
American University: Lee A. McElroy, Nina M. Roscher
Amherst College: Suzanne J. Everden, Peter J. Gooding
Anderson University (Indiana): A. Barrett Bates, Rebecca A. Hull
Angelo State University: Kathleen Brasfield, Kathleen M. Price, Michael P.
Ryan, Jerry Vandergriff
Appalachian State University: Alan J. Hauser
Arizona, University of: Kathleen L. LaRose, Jim Livengood
Arizona State University: Jill W. DeMichele, Jerry L. Kingston, Betsy J.
Mosher, Kevin M. White
Arkansas, University of, Fayetteville: Beverly R. Lewis, Tracey Mays Stehlik
Arkansas, University of, Little Rock: Charles E. Hathaway, Richard M. Mello
Arkansas, University of, Monticello: Morris Bramlett, Peggy Doss, Fred J.
Taylor
Arkansas State University: D. Barry Dowd, Sam R. Gennuso, Scott W. Lewis,
Chad Walker
Arkansas Tech University: Earle Doman
Armstrong Atlantic State University: Eddie Aenchbacher, John G. Brewer,
Robert A. Burnett, Will Lynch

Ashland University: G. William Benz, Sue Martensen Uebel, William J.
Weidner, Robert L. Wendling
Assumption College: Rita M. Castagna, Kevin L. Hickey
Auburn University: Barbara L. Camp, Stacy L. Danley, David A. Didion, Joy
Gaston, David Housel, William V. Muse, Carole A. Walker, Dennis Wilson
Augsburg College: Marilyn Florian
Augusta State University: William A. Bloodworth, Clint Bryant, Mary Lisko,
Maxine Maloney
Augustana College (Illinois): John R. Farwell, Bruce R. McCart
Augustana College (South Dakota): Sandra Jerstad
Aurora University: Mark Walsh
Austin College: Timothy P. Millerick, David Norman, Oscar C. Page
Austin Peay State University: Roy Gregory, Dave Loos
Averett College: Vesa Hiltunen

Babson College: Frank Millerick
Baldwin-Wallace College: Louis A. Barone
Ball State University: Richard J. Falls, David Land, John E. Reno, Andrea
Seger
Bard College: Scott Swere
Barry University: G. Jean Cerra, Mike Covone
Barton College: Gary W. Hall
Bates College: Suzanne R. Coffey, Marsha Graef
Baylor University: David M. Guinn
Beaver College: Shirley M. Liddle, Jan Walbert
Bellarmine College: Ann M. Jirkovsky, David P. O'Toole, Fred Rhodes
Belmont Abbey College: Robert A. Preston
Bemidji State University: Tom Richard
Benedictine University (Illinois): Laura T. Ames
Bennett College: Carl A. Bibbs, Gloria Randle Scott
Bernard M. Baruch College: William Eng
Bethany College (West Virginia): Wallace B. Neel
Bethune-Cookman College: John S. Frink, W. Floyd Laisure, Lynn W.
Thompson
Binghamton, State University of New York at: Alicia Goode Brewster, Lois
B. DeFleur, Sheryl Sousa, Joel Thirer
Blackburn College: Ira Zeff
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania: Mary Gardner, Preston Herring,
Brian Johnson, Jessica S. Kozloff
Bluefield State College: John S. Duffy
Bluffton College: Kim E. Fischer, Sara Lehman
Boise State University: Gene Bleymaier, Marcia Wicklow-Howard
Boston College: Eugene DeFilippo, Lynn K. Holleran
Bowdoin College: Sidney J. Watson
Bowie State University: Larry Wilson Jr.
Bowling Green State University: Shelley Appelbaum, Marvin L. Kumler,
Ronald E. Zwierlein
Bradley University: John R. Brazil, Virnette House, Kenneth E. Kavanagh,
Ron Koperski
Brandeis University: Barbara Bickford, Jeffrey W. Cohen
Bridgewater College (Virginia): Thomas M. Kinder
Bridgewater State College (Massachusetts): John C. Harper, Susan Crosby-
Tangen
Brigham Young University: Rondo Fehlberg, Barbara Day Lockhart
Brockport, State University College at: Linda J. Case, Susan A. Hoffman,
Ginny L. Studer
Brown University: David T. Roach
Bryant College: Linda C. Hackett

Bryn Mawr College: Barb Bolich, Jenepher P. Shillingford
 Buena Vista College: Roger Eglund, Marge Willadsen
 Buffalo, State University of New York at: Nanette Harvey, Dennis P. Malone,
 Bridget Niland, William F. Regan, Nelson E. Townsend
 Buffalo, State University College at: Earl Hilton, Gail F. Maloney
 Butler University: Jona Braden, Joseph L. Kirsch, John C. Parry
 Cabrini College: Leslie Danehy
 California, University of, Berkeley: Christine A. Dawson, John V. Kasser
 California, University of, Davis: Pamela L. Gill-Fisher, Melvin R. Ramey,
 Greg Warzecka
 California, University of, Irvine: Daniel G. Guerrero, Petrina M. Long, Lyman
 W. Porter
 California, University of, Los Angeles: Betsy G. Stephenson
 California, University of, Riverside: Sue Gozansky, Anthony W. Norman,
 Raymond L. Orbach
 California, University of, San Diego: Heather M. Hilliard, Maricela Ocegura,
 Judith M. Sweet
 California, University of, Santa Barbara: Steven Allaback, Gary A.
 Cunningham
 California Institute of Technology: Daniel L. Bridges
 California Lutheran University: Tina Hill
 California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo: Alison Cone, John
 F. McCutcheon
 California State Polytechnic University, Pomona: Frank Gibbons, Karen L.
 Miller
 California State University, Bakersfield: Rudy Carvajal, Brian McNamara
 California State University, Chico: Anita Barker, Don W. Batie
 California State University, Dominguez Hills: Boice Bowman, Harold
 Charnofsky, Ronald D. Prettyman, Julie Sandoval
 California State University, Fresno: Al Bohl, Diane Milutinovich
 California State University, Fullerton: Judith A. Anderson, John Easterbrook,
 Leon Gilbert, Maryalyce Jeremiah
 California State University, Hayward: Armando Gonzales, F. Douglas Weiss
 California State University, Los Angeles: Gerald Beer, Carol M. Dunn
 California State University, Northridge: Paul A. Bubb
 California State University, Sacramento: Judith A. Davidson, David Raske
 California State University, San Bernardino: Tara Fontana, Barry Knight,
 Nancy Simpson
 California State University, Stanislaus: Joseph T. Donahue, Isidro "Zeke"
 Duque, Marvalene Hughes, Wayne Pierce
 California University of Pennsylvania: Thomas G. Pucci
 Calvin College: Beverly Klooster, Marvin A. Zuidema
 Cameron University: Sam Carroll, Kim Vinson, Robert L. Ziegler
 Campbell University: Susan A. Berner, Tom Collins
 Canisius College: Judi Caserta, Daniel P. Starr
 Capital University: James L. Burke, Roger Welsh
 Carleton College: Andrew Hedden, Leon Lunder, Gerald Young
 Carnegie Mellon University: John H. Harvey, Joan E. Maser
 Carson-Newman College: David W. Barger
 Carthage College: Robert Bonn
 Case Western Reserve University: Nancy Gray, David M. Hutter, Kathy
 Karipides, Glenn Nicholls
 Castleton State College: Martha K. Farmer
 Catawba College: Bob Casmus, Fred Corriher, Dennis Davidson
 Catholic University: Jone Dowd
 Centenary College (Louisiana): Russ A. Sharp
 Centenary College (New Jersey): Patrick Zipfel

Central Arkansas, University of: Bill E. Stephens
 Central College (Iowa): Spencer Cox, John Edwards, Marjorie B. Giles, David
 Roe
 Central Connecticut State University: Michael Ansarra, Charles Jones Jr.,
 Frank R. A. Resnick, Robert E. Trichka
 Central Florida, University of: William G. Callarman, Jennifer Pultz
 Central Michigan University: James W. Damitio, Herb Deromedi, Marcy
 Weston
 Central Missouri State University: Ed Elliott, Paul H. Engelmann, Jerry M.
 Hughes, Cindy Parks
 Central Oklahoma, University of: Jeff McKibbin, John E. "Skip" Wagnon, J.
 W. Weatherford, W. Roger Webb
 Centre College: Kitty R. Baird, Michael E. Hammond, Ray K. Hammond
 Chadron State College: Bradley Roy Smith
 Chaminade University: Wayne M. Tanna
 Chapman University: David Currey
 Charleston, College of (South Carolina): Jerry Baker, William V. Moore
 Charleston Southern University: W. Howard Bagwell, Susan Peal
 Chatham College: Noreen O'Malley
 Cheyney University of Pennsylvania: Harold Johnson
 Chicago, University of: Starkey Duncan, Rosalie Resch, Lorna P. Straus,
 Thomas Weingartner
 Chicago State University: Al Avant, Jerald L. Henderson, Joell B. Mitchell,
 Trudy Smith
 Chowan College: Stan Lott, Becky McLawhorn, Diane M. Morea
 Cincinnati, University of: Nancy R. Hamant, Heather Lyke
 Citadel, The: Walter Nadzak
 Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges: Georgette DeVeres,
 David Wells
 Clarion University of Pennsylvania: Robert Carlson, Iseli K. Krauss
 Clark Atlanta University: Jean Bell Chandler, Richard Cosby, Edward Davis,
 Philip L. Hood, Adrienne Tinch
 Clark University (Massachusetts): Linda S. Moulton
 Clarke College: Lon Boike
 Clayton College & State University: Mason Barfield, Tom Eddins
 Clemson University: Cecil O. Huey Jr.
 Cleveland State University: Alice J. Khol, John Konstantinos, Douglas O.
 Stewart
 Coastal Carolina University: George F. "Buddy" Sasser
 Coker College: Kaye P. Crook
 Colby College: Marcella Zalot
 Colby-Sawyer College: Debi Field McGrath
 Colgate University: Janet A. Little, Mark H. Murphy
 College Misericordia: Michael W. Mould
 Colorado, University of, Boulder: Rich Cardillo, Karen Morrison
 Colorado, University of, Colorado Springs: Theophilus D. Gregory, Linda
 Bunnell Shade
 Colorado Christian University: Stanley Dyck, Dave Foster
 Colorado College: Susan Ashley, Roxanne Dale, Martin Scarano
 Colorado School of Mines: John A. Hogan, Marvin L. Kay
 Colorado State University: Christine Susemihl, Myron Terry
 Columbus State University: Frank D. Brown
 Concord College: Ron Burgher
 Concordia College (New York): Ivan Marquez
 Concordia University (Wisconsin): James Juergensen, Ken Witte
 Connecticut College: Kenneth McBryde
 Cornell College: Steve Miller
 Cornell University: Erik Weinick

Cortland, State University College at: Dolores A. Bogard, A. Lee Roberts, Judson H. Taylor
 Creighton University: C. Timothy Dickel, Bruce D. Rasmussen
 Curry College: Pamela S. Samuelson
 Dallas, University of: Rev. Msgr. Milam J. Joseph, Richard L. Strockbine, Fred Zuker
 Daniel Webster College: Donna Ruseckas
 Dartmouth College: Jo Ann Harper
 Davis and Elkins College: Will Shaw
 Dayton, University of: R. Elaine Dreidame, Ted Kissell
 Defiance College: Marvin Hohenberger
 Delaware, University of: John L. Burmeister, Mary Ann Hitchens, Edgar N. Johnson
 Delaware State University: William "Bill" Collick, Dwayne H. Henry, Germaine McAuley
 Delaware Valley College: Frank Wolfgang
 Delta State University: Milton L. Bradley, James H. Jordan, Elizabeth Pelezo, Kent Wyatt
 Denison University: Lynn Schweizer
 Denver, University of: Joel Maturi, Bernard J. Mullin, Daniel L. Ritchie, Nancy S. Sampson, Diane T. Wendt
 DePaul University: William D. Bradshaw, John McEnroe
 DePauw University: S. Page Cotton
 Dickinson College: Leslie J. Poolman, Judy Yorio
 District of Columbia, University of the: Emma J. Best, Alvin J. Darby
 Dowling College: Robert Dranoff
 Drake University: Donald V. Adams, Jean Berger, Lynn King, Keith C. Miller
 Drew University: Vincent Masco, Connee Zotos
 Drexel University: Anthony T. Caneris, Louis M. Marciani, Eric Zillmer
 Drury College: Penny Clayton, Bruce Harger
 Dubuque, University of: Connie Bandy Hodge
 Duquesne University: Brian Colleary
 Earlham College: Porter G. Miller
 East Carolina University: Richard R. Eakin, Mike Hamrick, Ernest W. Schwarz, Rosie Thompson
 East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania: Earl W. Edwards, Diane Husic, Carey J. Snyder
 East Tennessee State University: Kelly E. Andrews, John Quigley
 Eastern Connecticut State University: David G. Carter, Robert Horrocks, Sharlene A. Peter
 Eastern Illinois University: Richard A. McDuffie, Deborah Polca, Jerome P. Rodgers
 Eastern Kentucky University: Robert J. Baugh, Betty Werner
 Eastern Mennonite College: Lester R. Zook
 Eastern Michigan University: Carole J. Huston, Robert Okopny, Lee Reed, Tim L. Weiser
 Eastern Nazarene College: Nancy Detwiler
 Eastern New Mexico University: Thurman Elder, Rosie Stallman
 Eastern Washington University: Frank E. Nelson
 Edgewood College: G. Steven Larson
 Edinboro University of Pennsylvania: Bruce Baumgartner, Todd W. Henne
 Elizabeth City State University: Edward McLean, William A. Porter
 Elizabethtown College: Nancy J. Latimore
 Elmhurst College: Christopher M. Ragsdale
 Elmira College: Pat Thompson

Elon College: Clay Hassard, Vicki Hightower, Alan J. White
 Emerson College-Massachusetts College of Art: Rick Bagby
 Emory and Henry College: Louis Wacker
 Emory University: Cathy Benton, Chuck Gordon
 Emporia State University: Wilma Kasnic, William W. Quayle, John C. Rich, Kay Schallenkamp
 Endicott College: Larry R. Hiser
 Erskine College: Wilbur H. "Bill" Reames Jr.
 Eureka College: Martin Stromberger
 Evansville, University of: James A. Byers, J. Robert Knott, Laura Tietjen
 Fairfield University: Eugene P. Doris, Alison Sexton
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison: William T. Klika Jr.
 Fairleigh Dickinson University, Teaneck: Ann Gulino, Carl Viola
 Fairmont State College: David W. Cooper
 Fayetteville State University: Peggy L. Green, Horace Small, Clarence White Jr.
 Ferris State University: Tom Kirinovic, Mark Kosciuszko, Larry J. Marfise
 Ferrum College: Ted M. Kinder
 Fisk University: George Neely Jr.
 Fitchburg State College: Sue E. Lauder
 Florida, University of: Jeremy N. Foley, Jamie McCloskey, Ann Marie Rogers, Michael Spiegler
 Florida A&M University: Cynthia Dupont-Jones, Ken Riley
 Florida Institute of Technology: William K. Jurgens
 Florida International University: Orville M. (Butch) Henry III, William "Bill" Keppler, Robert "Tony" O'Neal
 Florida Southern College: Hal Smeltzly, Lois Webb
 Florida State University: Charles W. Ehrhardt, Kim Record
 Fontbonne College: Lee McKinney
 Fort Hays State University: Carolyn Bird, Edward H. Hammond, Glen F. McNeil, Thomas E. Spicer
 Fort Lewis College: Joel M. Jones, Duane A. Smith, Joel R. Smith Jr., Harlan Steinle
 Fort Valley State College: Fred Harrison Jr., Oscar L. Prater, Gwendolyn Reeves
 Framingham State College: Thomas M. Kelley
 Francis Marion University: R. Gerald Griffin, Lee A. Vickers
 Franklin College: Paul B. Marion
 Franklin and Marshall College: John A. Andrew, Patricia S. W. Epps, William A. Marshall
 Franklin Pierce College: Bruce Kirsch
 Fredonia, State University College at: Charles Davis, William E. Leslie, Thomas E. Prevet
 Frostburg State College: Susan Arisman, Loyal K. Park
 Gallaudet University: Richard L. Pelletier, Peg Worthington
 Gannon University: Michael Corbett, Philip H. Kelly, Kathleen McNally
 Gardner-Webb University: Chuck Burch, Jeff Tubbs
 Geneseo, State University College at: William Caren, John L. Spring
 George Mason University: Thomas J. O'Connor
 George Washington University: Susie Jones
 Georgetown University: Patricia A. Thomas
 Georgia, University of: Gary Couvillon, Vincent J. Dooley, Glada Horvat, Tom Landrum, Hoke Wilder
 Georgia College and State University: Stan Aldridge, Sondi M. Creglow, Rosemary DePaolo, Jerry W. Fly, Bruce Harshbarger
 Georgia Institute of Technology: Ida Neal-Smith, Charles Wiley

Georgia State University: Blaine Hughes, Orby Moss Jr., Carl V. Patton
 Gettysburg College: Gordon A. Haaland, Chuck Winters
 Glenville State College: Wayne de Rosset
 Gonzaga University: Mike Roth
 Gordon College: Walter Bowman, Brendan Cooney
 Goucher College: Geoffrey M. Miller, Debra Sherwin
 Grambling State University: Robert L. Piper
 Grand Canyon University: Keith Baker, Kris Naber, Claude Pensis
 Grand Valley State University: Joan Boand, Arend D. Lubbers, Tim W. Selgo,
 Danielle S. Tiernan, Donald W. VanderJagt
 Greensboro College: Kim A. Strable
 Greenville College: Sharon K. Alger, Jack Trager
 Grinnell College: Dee Fairchild
 Grove City College: Christopher W. Smith
 Guilford College: Michael R. Ketchum
 Gustavus Adolphus College: Alan I. Molde

Hamilton College: Susan Viscomi
 Hamline University: Katharine Romme
 Hampden-Sydney College: Joe Bush
 Hampton University: Mamie A. Rallins, Dennis Thomas, Zaphon Wilson
 Hanover College: Lynn Hall, Dick Naylor, Russell L. Nichols
 Harding University: David B. Burks, Greg Harnden, Wilt Martin
 Hardin-Simmons University: John Neese
 Hartford, University of: Patricia H. Meiser-McKnett, Janna Venice-Blais, S.
 Edward Weinswig
 Hartwick College: Kenneth Kutler
 Haverford College: Jessica Droste, Penelope C. Hinckley, Greg Kannerstein
 Hawaii, University of, at Hilo: William R. Trumbo
 Hawaii, University of, Manoa: Jim Donovan, Kaia Hedlund, Marilyn Moniz-
 Kahoonahano, Hugh Yoshida
 Heidelberg College: Martin Reno
 Henderson State University: Charles D. Dunn, David Gardner, Kenneth J.
 Turner
 Hendrix College: W. Dwayne Collins, Ann H. Die, Cliff Garrison
 High Point University: Heather Puckett, Mike Tuttle
 Hillsdale College: Mickey Craig, Michael J. Kovalchik
 Hiram College: Robert Thomas
 Hobart and William Smith Colleges: Susan Bassett, Joseph M. Berta, Michael
 J. Hanna
 Hofstra University: Cindy Lewis, Harry Royle
 Hollins College: Lynda J. Calkins
 Hood College: Helenmarie Macaulay, Olivia G. White
 Hope College: Brandon Graham, Anne Irwin, Raymond E. Smith, John L.
 Van Iwaarden
 Houston, University of: James Bandy, Richard W. Scamell
 Howard Payne University: Phil Fuller
 Howard University: Hank Ford, Morris Hawkins Jr., Sondra Norrell-Thomas
 Humboldt State University: S. Scott Barnes, Gail J. Fuels, Alistair W. McCrone
 Hunter College: David A. Caputo, Terry A. Wansart

Idaho, University of: Robert A. Hoover, L. Oval Jaynes
 Idaho State University: Irvin A. Cross, Nancy Graziano
 Illinois, University of, Champaign: David L. Chicoine, Mildred Barnes Griggs,
 Ronald E. Guenther, Karol A. Kahrs
 Illinois, University of, Chicago: Tonya McGowan
 Illinois Wesleyan University: Barbara Cothren
 Immaculata College: Lynne Reichert

Indiana State University: C. Sue Davis, Paul T. Edgerton, Andrea Myers,
 Dennis Raetz
 Indiana University, Bloomington: Clarence H. Doninger, William C. Perkins,
 Mary Ann Rohleder
 Indiana University of Pennsylvania: Harold "Pete" Goldsmith, Frances A.
 Nee
 Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne: Robert A. Barrett, Stanley
 "Butch" Perchan
 Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis: Linda F. Carroll,
 William N. Kulsrud, Michael Moore, Cheryl Sullivan
 Indianapolis, University of: Kenneth D. Borden, David Huffman, Suzanne
 C. Wiley
 Iona College: Rich Petriccione
 Iowa, University of: Robert A. Bowlsby, Christine H. B. Grant, Yvonne L.
 Slatton
 Iowa State University: J. Elaine Hieber, Barb Licklider, Eugene D. Smith
 Ithaca College: Elizabeth A. Alden, Kristen Ford, Peggy R. Williams

Jackson State University: Paul Covington, Melvin I. Evans, James Lyons,
 Sadie E. Magee
 Jacksonville State University: Jerry N. Cole, Hope P. Davis, James Hobbs,
 Harold J. McGee
 Jacksonville University: Pennie C. Brown, Thomas M. Seitz
 James Madison University: Donald L. Lemish, Janet D. Lucas
 Jersey City State College: Larry Schiner
 John Carroll University: Tony DeCarlo, Gretchen Weitbrecht
 John Jay College of Criminal Justice: Susan Larkin
 Johns Hopkins University: Thomas P. Calder, Tim Downes
 Johnson and Wales University: Karen Fontes, David T. Morris, Michael
 Pasquarella
 Johnson C. Smith University: William R. "Bill" Davis Jr., Eugene Hermitte,
 Dorothy Cowser Yancy

Kalamazoo College: Marilyn (Lyn) Maurer
 Kansas, University of: Robert E. Frederick, Janelle Martin
 Kansas State University: Cindy Fox, Robert R. Snell, Max F. Urlick
 Kean University: Patricia Hannisch, Glenn Hedden
 Keene State College: John C. Ratliff, Stan Yarosewick
 Kennesaw State University: Greg Clark, Dave Waples
 Kent State University: Judy Devine, Laing E. Kennedy, William Konnert
 Kentucky, University of: Sandra D. Bell, C. M. Newton, John J. Piccoro Jr.
 Kentucky State University: Betty M. Gibson, Donald W. Lyons, Cassie Osborne
 Jr.
 Kentucky Wesleyan College: William J. Meadors, James E. Welch
 Kenyon College: Robert D. Bunnell
 King's College (Pennsylvania): John J. Dorish, Cheryl Ish, Rev. James
 Lackenmier
 Kutztown University of Pennsylvania: Linda S. Crawshaw, Betty Wesner

La Roche College: Jim Tinkey
 La Salle University: Brother Joseph F. Burke, Kevin Ibach, Kathleen M.
 McNally
 La Verne, University of: Jimmy M. Paschal, Rick Simon
 Lafayette College: Eve Atkinson, Mitchell Hoffman
 Lake Erie College: Robert Benz, Sam Corabi
 Lake Forest College: Jackie A. Slaats
 Lake Superior State University: William J. Crawford, Charles W. Jones, Jill
 Wetthuhn

Lakeland College: Jane Bouche
 Lamar University: Dean Billick
 Lander University: Cheryl Bell, Susan C. Going, Jeff May, William C. Moran, Betty H. Williams
 Lane College: J. L. Perry
 Le Moyne College: Richard W. Rockwell
 Lebanon Valley College: Louis A. Sorrentino
 Lees-McRae College: Mary W. White
 Lehigh University: Joseph D. Sterrett
 Lehman College: Ron Carter
 LeMoyne-Owen College: E. D. Wilkens
 Lenoir-Rhyne College: Rufus L. Moretz, Joseph L. Smith
 Lewis University: Raphael Mascari, Paul Ruddy
 Liberty University: Kim Graham
 Limestone College: Ralph L. Pim
 Lincoln University (Missouri): Ronald E. Coleman, David B. Henson, Mary Beth Ochsner, David L. Shinholster, Earl Wilson
 Livingstone College: Clifton Huff, Bernell Jones
 Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania: Charles A. "Tod" Eberle, Sharon E. Taylor
 Long Beach State University: David Bernstein, Bill Shumard, Mary Ann Tripodi
 Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus: Margaret Alaimo, Ralph Engelman, Bernard W. Sullivan
 Long Island University/C. W. Post Campus: Vincent Salamone
 Longwood College: Patricia P. Cormier, Peter Stalteri
 Loras College: Jim Drendel, Dennis O'Connor
 Louisiana State University: Debbie Corum, Pat Culbertson
 Louisiana Tech University: Jerry W. Andrews, Jim M. Oakes
 Louisville, University of: Tom Jurich, Arthur M. Riehl
 Loyola College (Maryland): Diane M. Aikens, Joseph Boylan
 Loyola Marymount University: Pamela Wettig
 Loyola University (Illinois): Erica Chung, Carolyn V. O'Connell, Samuel P. Ramenofsky, Charles T. Schwarz
 Luther College: Richard Bernatz, Joe Thompson
 Lynchburg College: Jack M. Toms
 Lynn University: Greg Malfitano, James D. Matthews, Richard A. Young
 Macalester College: John Leaney, Vanessa Seljeskog
 Maine, University of, Orono: Sean Frazier, George L. Jacobson, Suzanne J. Tyler
 Maine Maritime Academy: William Mottola
 Manchester College: Tom Jarman, Martha Judge
 Manhattan College: Robert J. Byrnes, Sandra Sapone, Brother Thomas J. Scanlan
 Manhattanville College: Lawson Bowling, Karen Peterson
 Mankato State University: Don Amiot, Georgene Brock, Ronald L. Hybertson, Richard R. Rush
 Mansfield University of Pennsylvania: Roger N. Maisner
 Marian College (Wisconsin): Brian Gillogly, Shelly Grimm, Ronald Herr
 Marietta College: Jeanne Arbuckle, Debora Lazorik
 Marist College: Chandra Bierwirth, Timothy S. Murray
 Marquette University: William L. Cords, Gregory J. Naples, Kathryn Statz
 Mars Hill College: Ed Hoffmeyer
 Marshall University: Beatrice Crane, Robert Sawrey, Lance A. West
 Mary Washington College: Edward H. Hegmann
 Maryland, University of, College Park: Neil Brooks, Charles F. Wellford, Deborah A. Yow

Maryland, University of, Eastern Shore: Henry M. Brooks, Hallie E. Gregory
 Maryville University of St. Louis: Julie Fernandez, Lonnie Folks, Keith Lovin, David R. Pierce
 Marywood College: Mary Jo Gunning
 Massachusetts, University of, Amherst: Howard M. Davis, Robert K. Marcum, Al Rufe, Glenn M. Wong
 Massachusetts, University of, Boston: Charlie Titus
 Massachusetts, University of, Dartmouth: Bruce Wheeler
 Massachusetts, University of, at Lowell: Jon C. Hellstedt, Shannon LeBlanc, Joan Lehoullier, Dana K. Skinner
 Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts: Scott Nichols
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Tom Allen, John Benedick, Jean Heiney, Dick Hill
 Massachusetts Maritime Academy: Bob Corradi
 McMurry University: Robert Kuzma, Marvin Stringfellow
 McNeese State University: Tommy E. Bogle
 Medgar Evers College: Roy Anderson
 Memphis, University of: Nathan Essex, V. Lane Rawlins
 Mercy College: Neil Judge
 Mercyhurst College: Peter J. Russo
 Merrimack College: Robert M. DeGregorio Jr., Joseph Kelley
 Mesa State College: James F. Paronto
 Messiah College: Lori L. Braa, Jerry Chaplin
 Methodist College: Rita Wiggs
 Metropolitan State College of Denver: William Helman, Joan McDermott
 Miami, University of (Florida): Paul Dee, Maureen Lantz
 Miami University (Ohio): Eric Hyman, Harold W. (Hal) Jasper, Karen Womack
 Michigan, University of: Percy Bates, Peg Bradley-Doppes, Tom Goss, Derrick Gragg, John "Fritz" Seyferth Jr.
 Michigan State University: John Hardt, Michael L. Kasavana, Kathy Lindahl, Merritt J. Norvell Jr.
 Michigan Technological University: Suzanne Sanregret, Darrell W. Smith, J. Richard Yeo
 Middle Tennessee State University: Race P. Bergman, Lee G. Fowler, LeBrian McGill, Wendy Thompson, Diane C. Turnham
 Middlebury College: Randi Borgen, Andrew McPhee, Russ Reilly, Gail D. Smith
 Midwestern State University: Bob McBee, Rick Williams
 Millersville University of Pennsylvania: Daniel N. Audette, Thomas Greco, Bob Thomas, Marjorie A. Trout
 Millikin University: Curtis L. McCray, Linda M. Slagell
 Mills College: Helen Carroll
 Millsaps College: George M. Harmon, Ron Jurney
 Milwaukee School of Engineering: Daniel I. Harris
 Minnesota, University of, Duluth: Robert Corran, Linda M. Larson, Patricia A. Merrier
 Minnesota, University of, Morris: Mark Fohl
 Minnesota, University of, Twin Cities: McKinley Boston, Norman Chervany, Mark Dienhart, Jeff Schemmel, Christopher Schoemann, Mariah Snyder, Chris Voelz
 Mississippi, University of: Robert A. Weems, David K. Wells
 Mississippi College: Anita Gowin, Terry McMillan
 Mississippi State University: Kirk P. Arnett, David C. Boles, Samye Johnson
 Mississippi University for Women: Jo Spearman
 Mississippi Valley State University: John E. Johnson, Chuck Prophet
 Missouri, University of, Columbia: Bill Arnet, Rosalyn Dunlap, Carl Settergren
 Missouri, University of, Kansas City: Lee Hunt, Eleanor B. Schwartz

Missouri, University of, Rolla: Mark E. Mullin, Wendell R. Ogrosky, John T. Park, Sarah Preston
 Missouri, University of, St. Louis: Patricia A. Dolan, Thomas R. Schnell
 Missouri Southern State College: Heather Andrews, Sallie Beard, James L. Frazier, Bernie Johnson, John W. Tiede
 Missouri Western State College: Don Kaverman, Mary Margaret Nichols
 Molloy College: Robert C. Houlihan
 Monmouth University (New Jersey): Marilyn A. McNeil, Marilyn A. Parker, Jeff Stapleton
 Montana, University of: George M. Dennison, Wayne Hogan, James J. Lopach, Marie Porter, Jody Sykes
 Montana State University-Billings: Russell H. Lord
 Montana State University-Bozeman: Charles N. Lindemann, Calli Sanders
 Montclair State University: Holly P. Gera, Anita Kubicka, Gregory Waters
 University of Montevallo: Robert M. McChesney, Bob Riesener
 Moorhead State University: Steven V. Butler, Marlane Sanderson, Katy Wilson
 Morehead State University: Kathleen Worthington
 Morehouse College: Josh Culbreath, Willie G. Shaw, Dianne Williams
 Morgan State University: Tanya V. Rush, Charles R. Salters
 Morningside College: Bill Goldring, Beth Sibenaller, Molly Williams
 Morris Brown College: Beverly Arnaud, Gene Bright, Johnnie Dumas Myers
 Mount Holyoke College: Laurie Priest, Lynne Wilkie
 Mount Olive College: Willis A. Brown Jr., Allen M. Cassell
 Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland): Harold P. Menninger
 Mount Union College: Truman D. Turnquist
 Muhlenberg College: Stephen P. Erber, Connie R. Kunda
 Nazareth College: William H. Carey, Kerry Gotham, Annette Shapiro
 Nebraska, University of, at Kearney: Richard M. Dull, Bruce Elder, Gladys Styles Johnston, Brent W. Robinson, Patty Sitorius
 Nebraska, University of, Lincoln: Ted Harris
 Nebraska, University of, Omaha: Nanby Belck, Connie J. Claussen, Bob Danenhauer, Richard B. Flynn
 Nebraska Wesleyan University: Stuart M. Spero, Christy J. Wilson
 Neumann College: Sandra L. Slabik
 Nevada, University of: Chris Ault, Joseph N. Crowley, Christopher H. Exline, Angela D. Taylor
 Nevada, University of, Las Vegas: Carol C. Harter, Myrlene LaMancusa
 University of New England: Dennis Leighton, Karol L'Heureux
 New England College: Mary Allen Alger
 New Hampshire, University of: Stephen Hardy, David O'Connor, Judith L. Ray
 New Hampshire College: Joseph R. "Chip" Polak
 New Haven, University of: Deborah Chin, Robin Salters
 New Jersey, College of: Kevin A. McHugh
 New Jersey Institute of Technology: James Catalano
 New Mexico State University: Karen Fey, James T. Fisher, Jim Paul
 New Orleans, University of: Sybil A. Boudreaux, Ronald J. Maestri, Gregory M. St. L. O'Brien
 New Paltz, State University College at: Farron Bennett, James A. Zalacca
 New Rochelle, College of: Kathleen LeVache
 New York Institute of Technology: Clyde Doughty Jr., Indera Rampal-Harrod
 New York University: Christopher Bledsoe
 Newberry College: Peter French, Keith E. Wagner, William Grafton Young Jr.
 Niagara University: Barbara A. Green, Michael L. Jankowski
 Nicholls State University: Michael G. Knight

Nichols College: Thomas R. Cafaro, Jo Williams
 Norfolk State University: William D. Price, P. LaVerne Sweat
 North Alabama, University of: Sherry Kennemer, Robert L. Potts, K. Dan Summy
 North Carolina, University of, Asheville: Thomas B. Hunnicutt
 North Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill: Richard A. Baddour, John P. Evans
 North Carolina, University of, Charlotte: David Goldfield, Judy W. Rose, Denise Trauth, Kimberly Whitestone
 North Carolina, University of, Greensboro: David B. Knight
 North Carolina, University of, at Pembroke: Sandy Jones, Joseph B. Oxendine, Ray Pennington
 North Carolina, University of, Wilmington: Pat Howey
 North Carolina A&T State University: Dorothy J. Alston, Willie J. Burden, Edward B. Fort, James A. Williams Jr.
 North Carolina Central University: Les Brinson, William E. Lide, Sandra T. Shuler, Ingrid L. Wicker
 North Carolina State University: Arthur W. Cooper, James D. Miller
 North Central College: Walter J. Johnson
 North Dakota, University of: Kathleen McCann, Pete Oliszcak, George W. Schubert, Terry Wanless
 North Dakota State University: Lynn Dorn, Robert Entzion, Allan G. Fischer
 North Florida, University of: Richard Gropper, Adam W. Herbert, Kathleen Klein, Lucretia D. Simmons
 North Park College: Susan Lammell, Jack Surridge
 North Texas, University of: Roy E. Culberson, Craig Helwig, John Thornton
 Northeast Louisiana University: Richard C. Giannini
 Northeastern Illinois University: Joseph C. Morton, Melvin C. Terrell
 Northeastern University: Terry Condon, Richard Lapchick, Ian McCaw, David C. Wharton
 Northern Arizona University: Sam F. McClanahan, Wayne Sjoberg, Kelly Woodward
 Northern Colorado, University of: James Fallis, Robert L. Heiny, Denise O'Grady, Stormie Wells
 Northern Illinois University: Dee Abrahamson, Cary Groth
 Northern Iowa, University of: Christopher Ritrievi, Jack D. Wilkinson, Sandra C. Williamson
 Northern Kentucky University: Thomas J. Kearns, Jane Meier, Norleen K. Pomerantz
 Northern Michigan University: Judith Bailey, Rick Comley, James Suksi
 Northern State University: William Haigh, John M. Hilpert, James Kretchman, Lisa Schriver
 Northwest Missouri State University: Virgil Albertini, James C. Redd
 Northwestern State University: Gregory S. Burke
 Northwestern University: Frederick Hemke, Nancy Lyons, Charles F. "Rick" Taylor
 Northwood University: David W. Coffey
 Norwich University: Tony Mariano
 Notre Dame, College of (Maryland): Donna M. Ledwin
 Notre Dame, University of: Melissa L. Conboy
 Oakland University: Tracy Huth
 Occidental College: Dale V. Widolff
 Oglethorpe University: Donald S. Stanton, Bob Unger
 Ohio Northern University: Gale E. Daugherty, Gayle Lauth, Ellen Wilson
 Ohio State University: Andy Geiger, Archie M. Griffin, Susan M. Hartmann, Michelle O. Willis
 Ohio University: Thomas Boeh, Peggy J. Pruitt, Patrick S. Washburn
 Ohio Wesleyan University: Thomas B. Courtice

Oklahoma, University of: Daniel G. Gibbens, Lawrence E. Naifeh
 Oklahoma State University: James E. Halligan, Gerald M. Lage
 Old Dominion University: Mikki Flowers, James Jarrett, Janis V. Sanchez
 Old Westbury, State University College at: Ed Wolfarth
 Olivet College: Richard A. Kaiser
 Oral Roberts University: Richard L. Roberts, Veronica Trujillo, Terry Unruh
 Oregon, University of: Renee Baumgartner, Gary Gray, William Moos, James M. O'Fallon
 Oregon State University: Michael Beachley, Robert J. Frank
 Oswego, State University College at: Sandra L. Moore
 Otterbein College: Richard Fishbaugh, Patricia Wilson
 Ouachita Baptist University: Buddy Benson, Tom Murphree
 Pace University: Joseph F. O'Donnell, Ramona Polvere
 Pacific (California), University of the: Michael S. McNeely, Cynthia Spiro
 Paine College: Ricardo Bravo, Ronnie O. Spry
 Pennsylvania, University of: Carolyn Schlie Femovich
 Pennsylvania State University: John A. Bove, John J. Coyle, Tim Curley, Kerry McCoy, Ellen L. Perry
 Pennsylvania State University Erie, the Behrend College: Greg Morris, Brian F. Streeter
 Pfeiffer University: T. J. Kostecky
 Philadelphia College of Textiles and Science: Thomas R. Shirley Jr.
 Pittsburgh State University: Charles Broyles, John R. Darling, George Graham, Shannon O'Shea Schmieg
 Pittsburgh, University of: Kenneth F. Metz, Donna Sanft, Carol J. Sprague
 Pittsburgh, University of, Johnstown: J. Anthony Capon
 Plattsburgh, State University of New York at: Michael Miranda
 Plymouth State College: Stephen R. Bamford, Donald P. Wharton
 Pomona-Pitzer Colleges: Curtis W. Tong
 Portland, University of: Joseph A. Etzel
 Portland State University: Anne McCoy, Jim Sterk
 Prairie View A&M University: Jocelyn Tatum-Adams, Clinnon Harvey, Angela McMorris
 Presbyterian College: Brett Evilsizor, J. Allen Morris
 Princeton University: George H. VanderZwaag
 Principia College: Seth C. Johnson, Gregg Merrill
 Purdue University: Morgan J. Burke, Martha O. Chiscon, Joni Comstock, Philip E. Nelson
 Queens College (New York): Allen Lee Sessoms, Richard Wettan
 Quincy University: John Coats, James Naumovich
 Quinnipiac College: Linda J. Wooster
 Radford University: Douglas Covington, Rebecca McNeil, Michael J. Ricciardi
 Randolph-Macon College: Sue Bigs, Jeff Burns, Gregg Waters
 Randolph-Macon Woman's College: Valerie Cushman
 Redlands, University of: James R. Appleton, Carl R. Clapp, Christopher Walker
 Regis College (Massachusetts): Judith W. Burling
 Regis University (Colorado): Tom Dedin, Barbara J. Schroeder
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute: Robert F. Ducatte, Kerry Quinn
 Rhode Island, University of: Lauren E. Anderson, Donald E. McCreight, Christian D. Pope
 Rhode Island College: Donald E. Tencher
 Rhodes College: Mike Clary, David L. Harlow, Sarah Hargas
 Rice University: Alan J. Chapman, Steven Moniaci
 Richard Stockton College of New Jersey: G. Larry James

Richmond, University of: Harold W. Babb, Ruth Goehring, George N. Ivey
 Rider University: Curtis W. Blake
 Rivier College: Joanne Merrill
 Roanoke College: M. Scott Allison
 Robert Morris College: Bruce A. Corrie, Robert W. Norberg
 Rochester, University of: Jeffrey Vennell, Joyce Wong
 Rochester Institute of Technology: Louis W. Spiotti
 Roger Williams University: William M. Baird
 Rollins College: Dan O'Callaghan, J. Philip Roach
 Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology: Scott A. Duncan
 Rosemont College: Maggie Trainor, Pamela Wojnar
 Rowan University: Joy Reighn, Edward Streb
 Russell Sage College: Raymond C. Nause
 Rust College: David L. Beckley
 Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick: Frederick E. Gruninger, Francis L. Lawrence, Jeffrey I. Rubin, Rita Kay Thomas
 Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Newark: John K. Adams
 Sacred Heart University: C. Donald Cook
 Saginaw Valley State University: Robert T. Becker, George W. Eastland Jr., Richard P. Thompson
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College: Howard Reichner
 St. Anselm College: Ted Paulauskas
 St. Augustine's College: Bernard W. Franklin, Wanzo F. Hendrix, Irish Holmes
 St. Benedict, College of: Carol Howe-Veenstra, Lu Ann Reif, Lori Runksmeier
 St. Bonaventure University: David Diles
 St. Catherine, College of: Sheila Brown
 St. Cloud State University: Sue Becker, Arthur F. Grachek, Bruce F. Grube, Morris Kurtz
 St. Francis College (New York): Tom Thompson
 St. Francis College (Pennsylvania): Frank Pergolizzi
 St. John's University (Minnesota): Kenneth M. Jones
 St. John's University (New York): Edward J. Manetta Jr., Kathleen Meehan
 St. Joseph's College (Indiana): Linda Deno, Teresa Massoels, Albert J. Shannon
 St. Joseph's College (New York): Donald L. Lizak
 St. Joseph's University: Don J. DiJulia
 St. Lawrence University: John A. Clark
 St. Leo College: Ted Owens
 Saint Louis University: Lori A. Flanagan, Michael J. Ross, Doug Woolard
 St. Mary's College (California): Richard Mazzuto
 St. Mary's College (Indiana): Jan Travis
 St. Mary's College of Maryland: Paul R. Moyer
 St. Mary's University of Minnesota: Linda Anderson
 St. Michael's College: Geri Knortz
 St. Norbert College: Larry Van Alstine
 St. Olaf College: Chris Daymont, Lee M. Swan
 St. Paul's College: Sunday A. Adesuyi, Monique Morgan
 St. Peter's College: Kim E. Culligan, William A. Stein
 Saint Rose, College of: Cathy Haker
 St. Scholastica, College of: Kevin C. Snyder
 St. Thomas, University of (Minnesota): Jo Ann Andregg
 Salem State College: John D. Galaris
 Salem-Teikyo University: Gary S. McAllister, Lou Talerico
 Salve Regina University: Del Malloy, John J. Rok
 Sam Houston State University: Bobby Williams
 Samford University: Stephen C. Allgood
 San Diego, University of: Thomas Innacone
 San Diego State University: Justina Boyd, Jana Doggett, Ernst Griffin

San Francisco, University of: Sara Keenan
 San Francisco State University: Patricia Bartscher, Michael J. Simpson
 San Jose State University: Carolyn M. Lewis, Charles Whitcomb
 Santa Clara University: Lynda V. Tealer
 Savannah College of Art and Design: Karen A. Ryan
 Savannah State University: Carlton E. Brown, Hornsby Howell, Alicia Leverett, George N. Williams
 Seattle Pacific University: Robert Huber, Steve Moore, William Woodward
 Seton Hall University: George P. Browne, Peg Hefferan, Sue Regan, Laura A. Wankel
 Shaw University: Dianthia M. Ford, Ernest L. Pickens, Rudolph A. Williams
 Shepherd College: Barbara E. Beard
 Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania: Anthony F. Ceddia, Jane Goss, George Harpster, James G. Pribula
 Siena College: John D'Argenio, Joyce A. Legere
 Simpson College: Bruce F. Sloan
 Skidmore College: Tim Brown
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania: Robertha Abney, Bob Heller, Philip Kennedy, Paul A. Lueken
 Smith College: Lynn Oberbillig
 Sonoma State University: Bill Crowley, Bill Fusco, Kelly Van Winden
 South, University of the: Nancy Ladd, Robert W. Pearigen, Mark Webb, Mark Webb
 South Alabama, University of: Dale T. Adams, Joe Gottfried, Ron Rosenberger, Pamela E. Young
 South Carolina, University of, at Aiken: Robert E. Alexander, Timothy Hall, James Kauffman, Deborah Kladvko, Douglas R. Warrick
 South Carolina, University of, Columbia: Laurie Massa, Michael B. McGee, Valerie Sheley, Susie H. VanHuss
 South Carolina, University of, at Spartanburg: H. Michael Hall, John C. Stockwell
 South Carolina State University: Leroy Davis, Charlene Johnson
 South Dakota, University of: Jack F. Doyle, Mary Mock, John E. Powell
 South Dakota State University: Mylo A. Hellickson, Fred M. Oien
 South Florida, University of: Paul S. Griffin, Barbara Sparks-McGlinchy, Curtis W. Wienker
 Southampton Campus of Long Island University: Mary E. Topping
 Southeast Missouri State University: Joe Low, Dale Nitzschke, Lana Richmond, Carroll Williams
 Southeastern Louisiana University: Tom Douple
 Southern Arkansas University: Steven D. Dingman, Steven G. Gamble, Wit Watson
 Southern Colorado, University of: Patrick Bottini, Tito Guerrero, Les Morken, Tony Taibi
 Southern Connecticut State University: Antonio L. Aceto, Michael J. Adanti, Barbara Cleghorn, Larry Fitzgerald, Darryl Rogers
 Southern Illinois University at Carbondale: Harold R. Bardo, Donald L. Beggs, Charlotte West
 Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville: Jim Buck, Cynthia Jones, John Meisel, David Werner
 Southern Indiana, University of: Charles J. Bertram, Jon Mark Hall
 Southern Maine, University of: Albert D. Bean Jr., Heather Gilmour, Kim Turner
 Southern Methodist University: W. James Copeland Jr., Charles Howard, C. Paul Rogers III
 Southern Mississippi, University of: Nick Floyd, Helen Grant, Ronald G. Marquardt

Southern University, Baton Rouge: Marino H. Casem, Moses K. Dupre, Brenda L. Edmond
 Southern Utah University: Kathryn Berg, Jack Bishop
 Southern Vermont College: J. Scott Kilgallon
 Southwest Baptist University: Stephanie Miller, Kevin Schriver, C. Pat Taylor
 Southwest Missouri State University: Linda Dollar, R. Bruce Johnson, Greg Onstot, Bill Rowe, Mary Jo Wynn
 Southwest State University: Lloyd "Butch" Raymond
 Southwest Texas State University: Michael F. Alden
 Southwestern Louisiana, University of: Ray P. Authement, Melanie Richardson
 Southwestern University (Texas): Sherri Babcock, Glada C. Munt, Roy B. Shilling Jr.
 Springfield College: Edward Bilik, Betty L. Mann, Craig Poisson, Cathie Schweitzer
 Stanford University: Susan Simoni Burk, Ted Leland, Cheryl L. Levick
 Staten Island, College of: Eugene Marshall Jr., Terry Small
 Stephen F. Austin State University: Jake Locklear, Steve McCarty
 Stephens College: Marcia Kierscht
 Stetson University: Jeffrey P. Altier, Elizabeth J. Schumaker
 Stevens Institute of Technology: Dean M. Witty
 Stonehill College: Paula Sullivan
 Stony Brook, State University of New York at: Paul J. Dudzick, Eugene R. Katz, Richard F. Laskowski, Sandra R. Weeden
 Suffolk University: James E. Nelson
 Sul Ross State University: Kay Whitley
 Susquehanna University: Connie Harnum, Donald Harnum
 Swarthmore College: Karen E. Borbee, Robert E. Williams
 Sweet Briar College: Katelin Chmielinski, Bonnie J. Kestner
 Syracuse University: Kenneth A. Shaw
 Tampa, University of: Hindman Wall
 Tarleton State University: Susan Burton, Lamar Johanson, Jim Johnson, Dennis P. McCabe, Lonnie McMillan
 Tennessee, University of, at Chattanooga: James T. Green, Michael H. Jones
 Tennessee, University of, Knoxville: Carl W. Asp, Joan C. Cronan, Douglas A. Dickey, Malcolm C. McInnis Jr., William T. Snyder, Donna Thomas
 Tennessee, University of, at Martin: Benny Hollis, Phillip Miller
 Tennessee State University: Bernard Crowell, Vivian L. Fuller
 Tennessee Technological University: Thurston E. Banks, Marcia Borys, David L. Larimore
 Texas, University of, at Arlington: Peter D. Carlon
 Texas, University of, at Austin: Leroy Sutherland, Barbara Walker
 Texas, University of, at El Paso: Michael Gentile
 Texas, University of, Pan American: James Langabeer, Linda O'Daniel, R. Neal Rieke
 Texas, University of, at San Antonio: Bobby Thompson
 Texas A&M University, College Station: Thomas W. Adair III, Lynn Hickey
 Texas A&M University-Commerce: Margaret Harbison, James Randy McBroom
 Texas A&M University-Kingsville: Livia E. Diaz
 Texas Christian University: Joseph W. Helmick
 Texas Southern University: Gita P. Bolt, Harold Odom, Carol Hightower Parker
 Texas Tech University: Robert Burton, Judi Henry, Robert M. Sweazy
 Texas Woman's University: Richard Nicholas, Judy Southard, Frank Vitro
 Thiel College: David A. Armstrong

Toledo, University of: Peter A. Liske
 Towson University: Wayne Edwards, Nance Reed
 Trinity College (Connecticut): Richard J. Hazelton, Robin L. Sheppard
 Trinity University (Texas): Becky Crews, Julie Jenkins, Robert C. King
 Troy State University: Tom Bilello, Fred B. Davis, Melanie C. Davis, Jack Hawkins Jr., Jean W. Laliberte, Douglas C. Patterson, Johnny Williams
 Truman State University: Mary Sue Beersman, Walter H. Ryle, Kathy J. Turpin
 Tufts University: John A. Di Biaggio, Cristopher Pellegrino
 Tulsa, University of: Judy MacLeod, Crista Troester
 Union College (New York): Richard Sakala
 U.S. Air Force Academy: Denise Cohen
 U.S. Coast Guard Academy: Raymond Cieplik
 U.S. Military Academy: Lt. Gen. Daniel W. Christman, Col. Daniel M. Litynski, Bill Schutsky, Albert Vanderbush
 U.S. Naval Academy: Thomas Bates, Jack Lengyel, Richard D. Mathieu
 Upper Iowa University: Philip Langerman, Paul Rudolph
 Ursinus College: William E. Akin, Adele P. Boyd
 Utah, University of: Christopher P. Hill
 Utah State University: Charles Bell, Mary Ellen Cloninger, Michael Parent
 Valdosta State University: Herb F. Reinhard, Charles R. Tucker
 Valparaiso University: Bruce G. Berner, Alan F. Harre, Carl Hensley, Nona Richardson, William L. "Bill" Steinbrecher, Robb Vessely
 Vanderbilt University: C. Jeffrey Compher, Jim Morris, Mark Richard, June Stewart, William T. "Todd" Turner
 Vassar College: Andrew M. Jennings, Louise McCleary, Rob Morrissey
 Villanova University: Tim Hofferth, John A. Robinson Jr.
 Virginia, University of: Carolyn M. Callahan
 Virginia Commonwealth University: Cortney Cutchall, Richard L. Sander, Wendy Taylor
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Tim Parker
 Virginia Union University: James F. Battle, Stacey Jones
 Wabash College: David A. Phillips
 Wagner College: Walter C. Hameline, Robin Truiett
 Wake Forest University: Edwin G. Wilson
 Wartburg College: Gary Grace, Jill Gremmels
 Washburn University of Topeka: Larry D. Blumberg, Janet M. Degginger, Loren Ferre
 Washington, University of: Ralph Bayard, Nigel Burton, Barbara A. Hedges, Marie T. Tuite
 Washington and Jefferson College: John J. Gregor, Richard H. Soudan
 Washington and Lee University: Cinda L. Rankin, Michael F. Walsh
 Washington College (Maryland): Bryan Matthews
 Washington State University: Marcia L. Saneholtz, Samuel H. Smith
 Washington University (Missouri): Lynn S. Imergoot, John M. Schael
 Wayne State College (Nebraska): Peter Chapman, Sharon Vanis
 Wayne State University (Michigan): Bob V. Brennan, John D. Petersen, Christ Petrouleas
 Waynesburg College: Dan Baranik
 Weber State University: John Johnson, Michael Norman
 Webster University: Thomas Hart
 Wellesley College: Louise O'Neal, Suzanne T. Walmsky
 Wentworth Institute of Technology: David Lee Conrad
 Wesleyan University (Connecticut): John S. Biddiscombe, Gale Lackey
 West Alabama, University of: Donald C. Hines, Curtis Dan "Dee" Outlaw, Louis R. Smith Jr.
 West Chester University of Pennsylvania: Wendy R. Laubach, Edward M. Matejkovic, Paul M. Oliaro
 West Florida, University of: Richard Berg, Doug Palmer
 West Georgia, State University of: J. Blake Lanier
 West Liberty State College: David C. Brooks, James W. Watson
 West Texas A&M University: Ed B. Harris, Julie Saylor
 West Virginia University Institute of Technology: Michael L. Neese
 West Virginia State College: S. Bryce Casto
 West Virginia Wesleyan College: George A. Klebez
 Western Connecticut State University: Edward Farrington
 Western Illinois University: Helen Smiley, Donald Spencer
 Western Kentucky University: Kristi Hartley, Lewis B. Mills, Steven D. White
 Western Maryland College: J. Richard Carpenter Jr., Carol A. Fritz
 Western Michigan University: Kathy B. Beauregard, David Corstange, Greg Dodson, Ed Edwards, Diether Haenicke
 Western New England College: Eric Geldart
 Western New Mexico University: Scott Woodard
 Western State College of Colorado: Greg Waggoner
 Westfield State College: Edwin Abar, Nancy Bals, Kenneth Magarian
 Wheaton College (Illinois): Tony Ladd
 Wheaton College (Massachusetts): Gina Loudenburg, Chad Yowell
 Wheeling Jesuit University: John Mansuy
 Whittier College: David A. Jacobs, Joseph L. Price
 Wichita State University: Darlene Bailey, Bill Belknap, Eugene M. Hughes, Martin M. Perline
 Widener University: Bill Zwaan
 Wilkes University: Addy Malatesta
 William and Mary, College of: David J. Aday Jr., Barbara Blosser, Terry Driscoll
 William Paterson University of New Jersey: Arthur Eason, Dana Feltz, Sabrina Grant
 William Penn College: Michael Laird
 Williams College: Lisa Melendy
 Wilmington College (Ohio): Dan DiBiasio, Terry A. Rupert
 Wilson College: Lori Frey
 Wingate University: Beth Lawrence, Jerry E. McGee, Nicole Rohr
 Winona State University: Joel Akason, Larry Holstad
 Winston-Salem State University: Anne Little, Bodiford Stackhouse
 Winthrop University: Thomas N. Hickman
 Wisconsin Lutheran College: Paul Knueppel
 Wisconsin, University of, Eau Claire: Steve Kurth, Marilyn Skrivseth
 Wisconsin, University of, Green Bay: Otis Chambers, Charles A. Ihrke, Mark L. Perkins
 Wisconsin, University of, La Crosse: Carol Bassuener, Bridget Belgiovine, Doug Hastad, Amy Huchthausen, Judith L. Kuipers, Jane C. Meyer
 Wisconsin, University of, Madison: James L. Hoyt, Cheryl A. Marra, Michael A. Moss, Pat Richter, Rob Waeldner
 Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee: Rita Hartung Cheng, Deanna D'Abbraccio, Bud K. Haidet
 Wisconsin, University of, Oshkosh: Allen F. Ackerman, Carl "Burk" Tower
 Wisconsin, University of, Parkside: Lenny Klaver, William Murin
 Wisconsin, University of, Platteville: Mark Molesworth
 Wisconsin, University of, River Falls: Connie Foster, Dean Henderson, Gary A. Thibodeau
 Wisconsin, University of, Stevens Point: Frank O'Brien, Virgil A. Thiesfeld
 Wisconsin, University of, Stout: Steven P. Terry, John Wesolek

Wisconsin, University of, Superior: Steven Nelson
 Wisconsin, University of, Whitewater: Dianne Jones
 Wittenberg University: Jeff A. Ankrom, Carl F. Schraibman
 Wofford College: Ted R. Monroe
 Wooster, College of: Gordon Collins, Robert Malekoff, Brenda L. Meese
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute: Raymond R. Gilbert
 Worcester State College: Susan E. Chapman, Shawn McNamara
 Wright State University: Michael J. Cusack, Charles J. Hartmann, Peggy L. Wynkoop

Xavier University (Ohio): Ginger Fulton

Yale University: Barbara N. Chesler, Colleen Lim
 Yeshiva University: Richard Zerneck
 York College (New York): Stuart Bailin
 Youngstown State University: Frederick J. Blue, Leslie H. Cochran, Pauline N. Saternow, Vern Snyder

Conference Members

America East: Crystal L. Hudak, Chris Monasch, Julie Power Ruppert, Tracy Shoemake
 Atlantic Coast Conference: Rick Chryst, Thomas P. Mickle, John Swofford, David V. Thompson, DeLores S. Todd
 Atlantic 10 Conference: Linda M. Bruno, Jackie Campbell
 Big East Conference: Michael A. Tranghese, Stan Wilcox
 Big Sky Conference: Douglas B. Fullerton, Kathy Noble
 Big South Conference: Joyce Howse, Kyle B. Kallander
 Big Ten Conference: James E. Delany, Carol Iwaoka
 Big 12 Conference: Britton Banowsky, Lori A. Ebihara, Prentice Gautt, Dru Hancock, Steven J. Hatchell
 Big West Conference: Dennis A. Farrell, Robert L. Halvaks, Paula Y. Smith
 California Collegiate Athletic Association: Robert J. Hiebert, Keith Kephart
 Capital Athletic Conference: Richard C. "Dick" Cook
 Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conference: Alan H. Patterson
 Centennial Conference: Steven F. Ulrich
 Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Leon G. Kerry, Fredrick Omondi Okumu, Jacqueline McWilliams
 City University of New York Athletic Conference: Ted Hurwitz, Zak Ivkovic
 College Conference of Illinois and Wisconsin: Merle W. Chapman
 Collegiate Water Polo Association: Daniel Sharadin
 Colonial Athletic Association: Kathleen Hallock, Thomas E. Yeager
 Commonwealth Coast Conference: Steve Washkevich
 Conference USA: Sandra Biller, Noreen Morris, Michelle Murphy, Michael L. Slive, Brenda R. Weare
 Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Michael J. Welch
 Eastern College Athletic Conference: Clayton W. Chapman, Mary Lou Thimas
 Gateway Football Conference: Patty Viverito
 Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas J. Brown
 Great Lakes Valley Conference: Carl McAloose, Kevin Listerman
 Great Northeast Athletic Conference: David T. Morris
 Gulf South Conference: Michael Ingberg, Nathan N. Salant
 Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference: David P. Kreps, Ralph B. McBride
 Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: John Van Why
 Ivy Group: Carolyn Campbell, Jeffrey H. Orleans
 Lone Star Conference: Brian Briscoe, Fred Jacoby
 Massachusetts State College Athletic Conference: John Harper

Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference: Julie Christie, Barbara Church, Casey Comoroski, Richard J. Ensor, Karin Torchia
 Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association: Sheila K. Wallace Kovalchik
 Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association: Ralph McFillen
 Mid-American Conference: Rob Fournier, Jerry A. Ippoliti
 Mid-Continent Conference: Cindy A. Harris, Jon A. Steinbrecher
 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference: Charles S. Harris, Brenda H. McCoy, Nicole M. McCoy, Rod Wyatt
 Middle Atlantic States Conference: Linda E. Hopple
 Midwest Conference: Ruth E. Peterson, Ralph Shively
 Midwestern Collegiate Conference: Julie Cromer, Bret Gilliland, Jonathan B. LeCrone
 Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Carlyle Carter
 Missouri Valley Conference: J. Douglas Elgin, Patty Viverito
 New England Collegiate Conference: William M. Moore
 New England Women's Eight: Raymond Gilbert
 New York Collegiate Athletic Conference: Thomas Gallagher
 New York State Women's Collegiate Athletic Association: Terry Wansart
 North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Melanie Heitman-Nelson, Mike Marcil
 Northeast Conference: J. Stevens Hurlbut, John Iamarino
 Northeast-10 Conference: Darren Beers, F. Paul Bogan
 Northern California Athletic Conference: James P. Jorgensen
 Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference: Kurt L. Patberg
 Ohio Athletic Conference: Timothy W. Gleason
 Ohio Valley Conference: R. Daniel Beebe, Ronald J. English
 Old Dominion Athletic Conference: Brad Bankston
 Pacific-10 Conference: Thomas C. Hansen, Christine W. Hoyles, Mike Matthews, David Price
 Pacific West Conference: Elwood B. Hahn
 Patriot League: Constance H. Hurlbut, William R. Smith
 Peach Belt Athletic Conference: R. Greg Clark, Marvin Vanover
 Pennsylvania Athletic Conference: Shirley Liddle
 Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference: Steve Murray
 Presidents' Athletic Conference: John Gregor
 Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference: Thomas R. Wistrill
 St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Ira Zeff
 Skyline Conference: Karen Peterson
 South Atlantic Conference: Doug Echols, Matt Lawton, Thomas Quinlan
 Southeastern Conference: Leslie Claybrook, Elizabeth DeBauche, Damon Evans, Roy Kramer, James L. McCullough, Patricia W. Wall
 Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Rick Simon
 Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference: Stephen P. Argo
 Southern Conference: Gil Grimes, Laura Timmons, Wright Waters
 Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Wallace Jackson, Toney E. Means
 Southland Conference: Beth Ammons, Gregory Sankey
 Southwestern Athletic Conference: Patrick Carter, James Frank, LaRita Greer
 State University of New York Athletic Conference: Patrick R. Damore
 Sun Belt Conference: Robert J. Bernardi, Lance Boston, Craig Thompson
 Sunshine State Conference: Don Landry
 Trans America Athletic Conference: William C. Bibb
 University Athletic Association: Richard A. Rasmussen
 Upstate Collegiate Athletic Conference: Richard Sakala
 West Coast Conference: Michael M. Gilleran
 West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Barry Blizzard

Western Athletic Conference: Karl D. Benson, Margie H. McDonald, Dell Robinson, Teresa Kuehn
Western Collegiate Hockey Association: Bruce M. McLeod
Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: Gary F. Karner

Provisional Members

Anderson College (South Carolina): Ellen King
Arkansas, University of, Pine Bluff: H. O. Clemmons, Lawrence A. Davis Jr., Betty Hayes, Vannette W. Johnson
Belmont University: Maury Wayne Curry, Nancy Griffith, Kenneth Sidwell
Brigham Young University, Hawaii: E. LeRoy Overstreet, Eric B. Shumway, Ken Wagner
Brooklyn College: R. Vivian Acosta, Bruce Filosa
Cazenovia College: Marvin Christopher
Central Washington University: Gary C. Frederick, Ivory V. Nelson
Christian Brothers University: Bro. Michael J. McGinniss, Doreen M. Powell
Concordia University at Austin: William Driskill
East Central University: Bill S. Cole, Tim Green, Ray Hamlett
East Texas Baptist University: Kent Reeves
Eastern Oregon University: Peggy Anderson
Evergreen State College: Art Costantino, Janette Parent
Findlay, University of: Linda Jackson, Greg Knestrick, David C. Wallach, Ken Zirkle
George Fox University: Craig Taylor
Hawaii Pacific University: Barbara Burke
Hilbert College: Henry C. Falkowski
Incarnate Word, University of: Howard Patterson
Lasell College: Kristy Walter
Lesley College: Paula D. O'Gilvie
Lewis and Clark College: Greg Fredricks, Judy McMullen, Steve Wallo
Lewis-Clark State College: Gary Picone
Linfield College: Scott Carnahan
Maine, University of, Farmington: Blake Johnson
Maranatha Baptist Bible College: Greg Weniger
Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences: Kimberly Allen
Mount St. Joseph, College of: Jeff Long, Steven Radcliffe
Northeastern State University: Gil Cloud, Matt Cochran, Scott Pettus, Larry Williams
Oklahoma Panhandle State University: Danny Stone, Kim Teel
Ozarks (Arkansas) University of the: Rick Niece, Buddy Lee Smith
Pacific Lutheran University: Paul Hoseth
Pacific University (Oregon): Judy Sherman
Pittsburgh, University of, at Bradford: Christine Geary, Richard McDowell
Puget Sound, University of: William E. Dasher, Richard Ulrich
Rockhurst College: Frank Diskin
St. Edward's University: John Knorr, Debora Williamson
St. Martin's College: Bob Grisham
St. Mary's University (Texas): Steve Johnson, Charlie Migl, Ruth R. Rodgers
Schreiner College: J. Thompson Biggers, J. Barry Shaw
Southeastern Oklahoma State University: Glen D. Johnson, Donald A. Parham
Southwestern Oklahoma State University: Joe Anna Hibler, Kelli Litsch, Cecil Perkins
Texas Lutheran College: Kathryn Yandell
Texas Wesleyan University: A. G. Applin, Gilbert A. Holmes, Dave Voskuil
Trinity College (District of Columbia): Candice C. Poiss
Tusculum College: Jim Fields
Western Washington University: Lynda Goodrich

Westminster College (Pennsylvania): Joseph B. Fusco
Wheelock College: Edward J. Matz
Whitman College: Craig Gunsul
Whitworth College: Scott McQuilkin, Richard E. Schatz
Willamette University: James R. Friedrich, William G. Trenbeath

Affiliated Members

American Football Coaches Association: Chuck Neinas
Basketball Hall of Fame Tip-Off Classic, Inc.: Jake O'Donnell, William C. Sullivan
Black Coaches Association: Rudy Washington
College Gymnastics Association: Richard Aronson
Community College League of California: Joanne A. Fortunato
Division I-A Athletics Directors Association: Dutch Baughman, Gene E. Hooks
National Association of Basketball Coaches: James Haney
National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics: Michael J. Cleary, Patrick Manak, Bob Vecchione
National Association of Collegiate Women Athletic Administrators: Jennifer Alley
National Fastpitch Coaches Association: Lacy Lee Baker
U.S. Olympic Committee: Curt L. Hamakawa, Patrice Milkovich
Women's Basketball Coaches Association: Betty Jaynes

Corresponding Members

LeTourneau University: William T. Elder
Mary Hardin-Baylor, University of: Darla Kirby, Ben Shipp
Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges: Arleigh Dodson
Pittsburgh, Greensburg, University of: Dan Swalga
Pratt Institute: Michael Rogan
Puerto Rico, Bayamon, University of: Elda Baez, Ada Crespo, Alfredo Figueroa, Luis R. Reeves Garcia, Rose M. Hernandez-Virella, Doriscelis Roura Perez, William Titley
Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, University of: Hector B. Figueroa, Luis R. Basco Rivera
Texas, Corpus Christi, University of: Dan Viola
Western Oregon University: Ronald J. Brinegar, Jon Carey

Visitors

Bond, Schoeneck & King: Kathy Jones
California Community Colleges Athletics Commission: Tom K. Harris Jr.
Center for School Change/University of Minnesota: Joe Nathan
Charlotte Regional Sports Commission: Chip Mark
Collegiate Athletics Consulting: Steve Horton
Confidence: Sonya L. Wesley
Dallas Baptist University: Wayne Poage
Fair Test: Charles Rooney
Good Sports, Inc.: Valerie M. Bonnette
Harsh, Emily H.
Ice, Miller, Donadio & Ryan: Kristine Camron, Angel Fleetwood
Kaplan Educational Centers: Robin Gusick
King College: Joe Hakes
Lamar Daniel, Inc.: Lamar Daniel
Learfield Sports: Roger Gardner
Long, Aldridge & Norman: Evan Appel, Adrienne Lotson, Jim Thomas
Narol, Melvin S.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities: David L. Warren
 National Association of State Boards of Education: Jeanne Kling
 NCAA Division II Presidents Council: Asa N. Green
 New York, State University of Maritime College: James Migli
 Rose Bowl: Ken Burrows, Bob Cheney, Mel Cohen, Gary Dorn, Caron Fletcher, Reginald Woolfolk
 Seattle University: Nancy Gerou
 Simon Fraser University: Michael Dinning
 Smith Consulting Services: R. Dale Smith
 Southern Oregon University: Monty Cartwright
 StadiaNet Sports: Mike Henry, Clyde Walker
 Walt Disney World Sports: John A. Bisignano Jr.

Working News Media

Amusement Business: Tom Powell
 Associated Press: John Bazemore, Tom Saladino, Dan Sewell
 Atlanta Journal-Constitution: Tony Barnhart, Mike Fish, Charlotte Teague
 Baton Rouge Advocate: Dave Moormann
 CBS Sports: Michael Aresco, Ray Harmon, Sean McManus, Tony Petitti
 Chronicle of Higher Education: Thomas England, Jim Naughton
 CNN/SI: Chuck Luther, David Seigerman
 Danville Register: Al Milley
 Des Moines Register: Tom Witosky
 Detroit News: Fred Girard
 ESPN: Len DeLuca, Dan Margulis, John Wildhack
 Fox Sports South: Bill Irish, Jamie Kimbrough
 Kansas City Star: Mike McGraw, Steve Rock
 Los Angeles Times: Lisa Dillman, Bill Dwyre
 NCAA Photos: Jennifer Logan
 Southern Soccer Scene: Dale Terry
 Syndicated Sports Columnist: Jimmie McDowell
 Touchdown Publications: Robert Fulton
 Turner Sports: David Maggard
 WAGA-TV: Donald Daly
 WXIA-TV: Richard Crabbe, Ed Reams, Randy Waters

■ 92nd Annual Convention Opening Business Session

Sunday Afternoon, January 11, 1998

The 92nd annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association was called to order at 4:45 p.m., with Washington State University President Samuel H. Smith, chair of the NCAA Executive Committee, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Smith: Welcome to the opening business session ladies and gentlemen. As chair of the Executive Committee, I will be presiding over this opening session.

I am sure many of you are aware that this is the first Convention under the new structure. The new structure that we are operating under now is under the leadership role of the chief executive officers in the governance of intercollegiate athletics, but also allows the three divisions to act more independently in governing the affairs of their divisions. Two chairs of the presidential governance bodies are with me today. Please welcome Adam Herbert, chair of Division II, and Curtis McCray, chair of Division III. (Applause) Due to some scheduling conflicts, Ken Shaw, chair of the Division I Board of Directors, will be arriving later. We also have with us today Ced Dempsey, NCAA executive director. (Applause) Also, Alan Chapman, the NCAA parliamentarian. (Applause)

I am going to function as the chair of the opening session because of my role as the chairman of the Executive Committee. Let me say a couple of words about the unique role of the Executive Committee under the new structure. The Executive Committee is really the primary entity within the new structure that is comprised of CEOs from each of the three divisions. The primary role of the Executive Committee is to review and approve the Association's budget. Each of the three divisions individually review and approve their own budget, the Executive Committee is responsible for approving the Association's budget as a whole. It is also important to remember that the Executive Committee does not have the authority to sponsor or amend legislation. That is the responsibility of each division's governance structure. The Executive Committee has the authority and the responsibility to call for a vote of the entire membership on the action of any one division if it determines that the action of that division is contrary to the basic purpose and fundamental principles set forth in the constitution.

I would like to say a couple of words about the format of this year's Convention and how it will be different from those of past years. The session we are in now is really the only business session for representatives of all three divisions that will be meeting together. All of the other business of the Convention will take place in your separate divisional business sessions or discussion forums. Divisions II and III are retaining the one-institution one-vote system of amending legislation, so there will be voting in Divisions II and III business sessions. Division I, however, has moved its representative system for managing Division I legislation, so there is no voting session in

Division I this year. Division I members will participate in a program of forums and discussion sessions tomorrow. I am sure that the delegates will find them both educational and extremely worthwhile. The Convention will still present opportunity for representatives of all three of the divisions to interact. You can do this in a social setting, including the honors dinner tonight, I hope to see all of you.

In the past, you may recall that we used this opening session to adopt the Convention Program and receive reports from various groups within the governance structure. However, to the extent such action remains necessary, it will be done in your separate divisional business sessions. The schedule for your various business sessions and other related meetings are set forth in the program. One item of business that we will conduct during this session is the report of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. I ask the delegates, visitors and our friends in the news media to please remain silent during the reading of the memorial resolutions.

Now, may I present Connie Foster, the University of Wisconsin, River Falls, for her report. Connie.

REPORT OF MEMORIAL RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Connie Foster (University of Wisconsin, River Falls): At this time, I would like to recognize the other members of the Memorial Resolutions Committee. They are: Larry Fitzgerald, Southern Connecticut State; Charlene Johnson, South Carolina State University; Judith Ray, University of New Hampshire; and Charles Wellford, University of Maryland, College Park.

Following is a listing of those men and women who have passed away since we last met.

Administrators:

Hubert Anderson Jr., Gallaudet
Lynn Archibald, Brigham Young
Richard Baker, Vanderbilt
James Banner, Carnegie Mellon
George Barclay, North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Sam Barnes, District of Columbia
Stan Bates, Washington State
Chris Bockrath, Delaware Valley
Paul Bogan, Northeast-10 Conference
Paul Brechler, Western Athletic Conference
Janet Bristor, Trinity (Texas)
George Brown, Case Western Reserve
Jack Bruen, Colgate
Lloyd Cardwell, Nebraska-Omaha
Roy Chipman, Pittsburgh
Ellery Clark Jr., Navy
Bob Cope, Kansas State
Bob Courtnay, Hendrix
Willie Coward, Stillman
Ed Danowski, Fordham
I. V. Davis, St. Francis (Pennsylvania)
Anne Lee Delano, Bryn Mawr
Bob Devaney, Nebraska-Lincoln
Dorothy Dreyer, Wayne State (Michigan)
Bill Easton, Kansas

Earle Edwards, North Carolina State
"Tuffy" Ellingsen, Washington State
Bill Flynn, Boston College
Wendell Forbes, Middlebury
Bob Frailey, American
Joseph Grassi, Fairfield
Tom Greenhoe, Minnesota-Twin Cities
Ben Gregory, Colorado
Tatum Gressette, Citadel
David Hall, Rice
Terry Hall, Wright State
Darrell Halloran, Pace
Steve Hamilton, Morehead State
Sterling Harshman, Pacific Lutheran
Bob Hartley, Mississippi State
Lee Hayley, Auburn
Bruce Honaski, Maine
Scoop Hudgins, Southeastern Conference
Clarence Iba, Tulsa
George Katchmer, Millersville
DeLaney Kiphuth, Yale
Larry Korpitz, Purdue
Norvell Lee, St. Augustine's
Norm Levine, Brandeis
Dan Libera, Northern Colorado
Mike Long, Florida State
Dan Malley, Pacific (California)
"Abe" Martin, Southern Illinois-Carbondale
Bill McArthur, Western Oregon
Oliver McClendon, Clark Atlanta
Jim McDonald, Tennessee-Knoxville
Mike McGlinchey, Salisbury State
Rod Milburn, Southern-Baton Rouge
Harold Nichols, Iowa State
Robert North, Hamilton
Mike O'Connor, Bucknell
Brian Pearson, Morningside
Keith Piper, Denison
Abe Poffenroth, Eastern Washington
Linda Puckett, Southeastern Louisiana
Christopher Roulhac Jr., Albany State (Georgia)
Jack Ryan, North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Jimmy Satcher, West Alabama
Aldo Sebben, Southwest Missouri State
Carl Stewart, Southern-Baton Rouge
Bill Strannigan, Wyoming
Jack Swartz, Wheaton (Illinois)
Charles Taff, Maryland-College Park
William Thomas Sr., Western Maryland
Neal Tremble, Northeastern Illinois
"Babe" Tysseling, Central (Iowa)
"Doc" Urich, Northern Illinois

DuWayne Wacker, North Dakota
"Rut" Walter, Wisconsin-Madison
Glenn Warner, Navy
Bob Wheeler Jr., Queens
John White Jr., Hampton

Student-Athletes:

Pat Boyce, Missouri-Rolla
Gerry Case, Loyola (Maryland)
Stephanie Collier, Arizona State
Seth Dunscomb, Kansas
Ronnell Felton, Niagara
Christopher Grammel, Defiance
Sean Granger, Defiance
Hilary Grivich, Houston
Patrick Gullahorn, Vanderbilt
Terrence Harvey, Brigham Young
Rafael Jordan, Georgia
Bryan Kennedy, Fontbonne
Tony Kirkpatrick, Lawrence
Joseph LaRosa, Wisconsin-La Crosse
Keffer McGee, Mississippi State
Kyle O'Brien, Cal State Fullerton
Ethan O'Neal, Catawba
Eddie Powell, Oklahoma State
Michael Priest, Wyoming
Jefferey Reese, Michigan
Julie Reitan, Arizona
Nancy Rivera, Lehman
Shaun Roth, Defiance
Ja'Mine Rozzell, New Mexico
Crayton Sanders Jr., Bethune-Cookman
Billy Jack Saylor, Campbell
Shannon Smith, Hawaii
Trey Taylor, Greensboro
Walter Turner, Florida Atlantic
Daniel Van Etten, West Virginia
Johnny Warren, Middle Tennessee State
Marvin Webster Jr., Temple

Please stand and observe a moment of silence for those who have gone before us.

Thank you. If you know of persons who should be added to the list, please contact a member of the committee or the national office staff.

Mr. Smith: Once again, thank you, Connie Foster and the Memorial Resolutions Committee. To continue with this opening session, we are very fortunate in this Association to have an outstanding executive director. Cedric Dempsey has been doing a very, very fine job for all of us.

We will have an opportunity now to hear from him as he will present the State of the Association Address. Please welcome Ced Dempsey. (Applause)

STATE OF THE ASSOCIATION ADDRESS

Mr. Dempsey: Thanks, President Smith, and good afternoon. This is somewhat embarrassing for me to look around the room and see the number of

empty seats. I have a good friend who is on television this afternoon. He is the coordinator for the Green Bay Packers. We were classmates, teammates and coached together for a number of years. When he finds out that his ratings were higher than mine, I may have a hard time explaining that to him. We are dimming the lights, so if any of you want to sneak out during the meeting, you can do that. (Laughter)

It is rare that we use this particular forum to honor individuals who have volunteered service to the NCAA. But there is an individual among us who is rare in both the length and breadth of service provided to this organization. This individual has served the membership in numerous roles on an uninterrupted basis for the last 34 years. His service began in 1964, as a member of the Nominating Committee. Since that beginning, he has served on 20 standing and special committees. In 1973, he was elected president of the NCAA. Attaining that office has frequently marked both the pinnacle and the end of service for NCAA volunteers, but for Alan Chapman, it was only the beginning. For the last 25 years, Alan has been as much of a fixture of this dais as the American flag. As parliamentarian for the past 29 Conventions, he has brought stability and order to our proceedings in a way that has gained the respect of his colleagues and the absolute devotion of those who have chaired these gatherings and who have received his wise counsel and unerring rulings. Alan, I present to you this plaque as recognition and a memento of your service to the organization. It says: "Alan Chapman, Mr. Mootnicity, in recognition of his significant contributions as NCAA parliamentarian, 1974-1998."

Ladies and gentlemen, Alan Chapman, Rice University. (The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.)

Alan, we know this is not the first plaque that you have received from the NCAA, nor do we expect it will be the last. We look forward to your adding to those 34 years of service to this organization. For those of you who do not understand the term "mootnicity," Alan has agreed to hold a short seminar here at the dais afterwards to define that term. It is a long-accepted term within this Association. (Laughter)

Today, as we look at the state of this Association at the end of an eventful 1997, significant change characterizes both the year and the organization.

First, as soon as last year's Convention ended, the final stages of work began on our transition to a new governance structure.

By creating an Executive Committee composed entirely of college presidents and by the establishment of presidential bodies at the head of governance for all three divisions, this Association has finally responded to the pleas of more than 90 years for college presidents to "take charge" of college athletics.

Today's structure goes well beyond the symbolic link between the goals of college sport and the mission of higher education. College presidents—the same men and women who are responsible for the fulfillment of their institutions' missions—are now constitutionally mandated to lead and influence the work of the NCAA.

Moreover, the entire governance structure is more broadly based. The total number of membership volunteers has grown by more than 50 percent, or in other words, from approximately 300 to 450 volunteers. That means that more of you are actively engaged than ever before in the integration of college sports with higher education.

Second, the change in structure means a change in the role of the nation-

al office staff. There is a new expectation by the presidential bodies for the staff to be even more engaged in the problem-solving process. However, the tradition of quality service to the membership and execution of the membership's decisions have been and will continue to be standards of performance by your national office.

Third, there is more change ahead for the staff and the membership as new headquarters are constructed and the national office moves to Indianapolis. For 46 years, Kansas City has been the home of the NCAA, and a good home it has been. But we must move forward. Ground will be broken on the new site in March 1998, and we can expect to complete the move by the fall of 1999.

Make no mistake about it; this move represents significant change—for the staff and for the membership. Among our greatest challenges over the next few years will be the successful transition of our staff to our new office, while we fully discharge our obligations to the membership.

But the move to Indianapolis also signals new opportunities. This move will place the Association's national office in a community that has worked hard to fulfill its own dream to become the amateur sports capital of the world. And it moves the national office closer to the center of our membership's population, which provides an increased opportunity as a meeting place for the membership.

Significantly, the move will allow the Association to open the doors of its new headquarters debt free. When the decision was announced, we noted a savings of \$50 million to the Association over the next 20 years. But we are confident that the savings to the Association will continue to grow well beyond that estimate.

Fourth, as we work to make the transition to Indianapolis, we have recognized that change may be nowhere more pervasive, more predictable and sometimes more perplexing than in the area of technology. The Association's Internet site—NCAA Online—which we launched only a year and one-half ago, has grown steadily to meet the explosive demand for information.

Still, we know that this is only the beginning. The opportunities are abundant—if not limitless—for rapid delivery of information, exchange of ideas and even decision-making through the focused and intelligent use of new technology.

In a division forum at this Convention, we will show you how the national office can continue to help the membership meet its needs for interactive communication. We must explore and exploit how we can use cutting-edge technology in the Internet, telecommunications and data exchange to benefit all our constituents.

A fifth area of change that I want to emphasize is the dynamic tension between the need for increased revenues and the NCAA's mission. College sports are more popular than ever before, and that popularity has resulted in our ability to generate more revenues through gate receipts, television contracts, fund-raising and corporate sponsors. At the same time, operating costs have increased, driven largely by the impact of rising tuition on financial aid; the desire for more and better facilities; rising administrative and coaching salaries; and the cost associated with our commitment to comply with Title IX.

Positioned squarely in the middle of these competing forces are the student-athletes who see prosperity for everyone except themselves. They may not know of—or appreciate—the economic imperatives. They may wonder

why they aren't participating more significantly in what may appear to be the new gold rush. I want to talk more about this topic in a few moments.

These are perhaps the most far-reaching of the changes that took place in the NCAA in 1997. It truly has been an eventful year. Indeed, we can expect change to be a constant companion and a constant challenge to us for the rest of the millennium.

We in the national office have begun to address these changes by developing planning priorities through the year 2001. I want to share these priorities with you, and I will report back to you on their status over the next 3½ years.

First, we must continue to implement the Association's new governance structure. Over the next couple of days, you will hear more from your divisional leaders regarding the first steps in this process.

There are at least eight significant areas that merit focused attention.

- We must implement the budget process for each division and the Association as a whole so that we put our resources to use in the most efficient manner possible.

- We must identify and address issues that may affect the three divisions both in relation to each other and with the Association as a whole.

- We must clarify and reinforce presidential control and leadership.

- We must assure that our committee structure is successful in terms of consistent communication that leads to sound decision-making.

- We must further define the role of the Executive Committee vis-a-vis the other governing bodies.

- We must implement the new legislative process in Division I and maintain the NCAA Convention as a focal point in the Association's calendar. I believe that the Convention is, and should continue to be, a vital part of our Association-wide communication, debate and decision-making.

- We must develop rules appropriate to the new federated structure.

- And lastly, we must develop an information technology system as our primary means of communication.

A second priority for the next three years is the management of NCAA 2000—the transition to the new national headquarters. This is more than just a move to a new city. We have to oversee the design and construction of a new workplace environment, debut the new Hall of Champions, and relocate the staff and office. We must create the best possible headquarters for this Association. We will be working to establish a corporate and a civic partnership with the city of Indianapolis.

During this transition, we will strive to maintain workplace effectiveness and the quality of service you expect.

A third priority will be to develop and implement a coordinated public relations plan designed to enhance public support and understanding of the NCAA's mission, role, challenges and achievements. The Association has a number of public relations challenges where the public believes, rightly or wrongly, that our institutional practices fall short of our high ideals. For example

- The influence of money.

- Issues related to Title IX.

- Matters of diversity.

- And, integrity in intercollegiate athletics.

The first step in developing a sound public relations plan must include survey research focused on the perceptions of key NCAA constituents. It

must include message development and testing, and then implementation of a comprehensive communications plan that conveys the NCAA story.

A fourth and very important priority is balancing the Association's mission and values with marketing and promotional initiatives. The leadership has made it clear that it is important to strengthen our marketing efforts:

- By establishing the NCAA as a domestic and international sports identity.
- By promoting the growth of international marketing and licensing.
- And, by broadening the NCAA's marketing, licensing and promotional opportunities.

At the same time, it is imperative that we monitor the level of commercialization to maintain a balance with our mission.

This isn't new territory. In 1922, in his State of the Association comments to the 17th annual NCAA Convention, General Palmer A. Pierce, the first and longest-serving president of the NCAA, warned the delegates of the effects of commercialization.

He said, "The enormous receipts tend to make of this modern, intensely spectacular game a great business proposition—one to be conducted for the money that is in it rather than for the benefit it can and should be to the educational life of our colleges."

Sounds pretty familiar to us 75 years later, doesn't it? In all our programs, we must be mindful of both the fiscal imperatives and our responsibility to our mission.

That brings me to the final, and clearly the most important, priority—our mission, to keep the interests of student-athletes at the heart of NCAA decision-making. It is in times of change such as now that we must return to first principles—for us, that is the centrality of the student-athlete.

As a member of the secretariat of the higher education organizations, I participated in a strategic planning retreat a few weeks ago. A clear message that emerged from that retreat was that we are in the midst of a learning revolution. In this paradigm, the institution exists for the student. It is a paradigm in which the focus has shifted from teaching to learning, and from the teacher to the learner.

The parallel to our enterprise is obvious: intercollegiate athletics must exist for the student-athlete. And so, it is to this first principle that we must continually return. We exist because there are student-athletes. This is the priority that must be first on the agenda for all of us.

Today, our revenues have grown far beyond anything Gen. Pierce and his generation could have imagined. The budget this year is \$267 million, 85 percent of which is returned to the membership in the form of direct dollars, championships and services. We have done much to add to the welfare of our student-athletes. We have created the special assistance fund, the academic enhancement fund, catastrophic-injury insurance, and the postgraduate and degree-completion scholarships. Through these funds, we distribute more than \$36 million annually for student-athletes.

But not all student-athlete interests are financial and not all problems can be solved with money. Therefore, I solicit your support in making sure in the next three years that we focus on the five following student-athlete interests.

The first focus: I want to make sure that we are committed to a continuing dialogue with student-athletes. We cannot learn until we listen, and we cannot make wise decisions until we understand. I ask you, is your student-

athlete advisory board operating? Are you providing your student-athletes an opportunity to be heard in an open and nonthreatening environment? If the answer is no, I would encourage you to focus on these matters.

The second focus: I want to make sure that we are committed to the academic success of our student-athletes. We must not be afraid to evaluate our initial- and continuing-eligibility requirements. At the same time, we need to ensure that our practices promote academic success.

For example, are you monitoring the balance between the time your student-athletes are engaged in their athletics and their academic pursuits? I ask you, are 16 basketball games in a five-week period during exams appropriate? Or is a situation in which athletes are only on campus six days within a two-week exam period acceptable? We must make sure our practices align with our ideals.

The third focus: I want to make sure that we are contributing to the development of student-athlete life skills—skills that bring meaning and purpose and fulfillment long after life on the playing field is finished. We now have 201 institutions participating in our life skills program. Does your institution have a commitment to this program? If not, I encourage you to evaluate your efforts and have one up and running at this time next year.

The fourth focus: I want to make sure the NCAA leads by example with regard to issues of inclusion and diversity. Everyone benefits from diversity of thought, experience and leadership. This is especially true for young student-athletes as it relates to diversity within our coaching ranks. In your last recruitment for a coach, what steps did you take to increase the ethnic and gender diversity of your staff? Our performance in this area leaves much to be desired. We must all re-double our efforts.

And, finally: I want to encourage the discussion that has begun on the appropriateness of the term "amateur" as it applies to today's student-athletes. Does the very term with all its symbolic and historic meanings place unfair perceptions, expectations and unnecessary limitations on student-athletes? I encourage those committees reviewing this topic to propose a new paradigm that reflects current reality vis-a-vis what it means to be a college eligible student-athlete.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that addressing these five challenges is critical if we are to meet our mission, our core values, our first principles.

I encourage each of you to take up these challenges as we begin 1998. The truth is, win-loss records and profit and loss statements will be forgotten. In the end, we will be judged by the world, our peers, ourselves and those student-athletes who pass through our doors on how successfully we fulfill our mission.

I thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Smith: Thank you very much, Cedric. Ladies and gentlemen, please do not forget that we have our honors dinner at 7:30 this evening in the centennial ballroom.

This concludes the business of the day. Thank you very much for your attention. We will see you tonight.

[The opening business session was concluded at 5:30 p.m.]

■ NCAA Honors Dinner

Sunday Evening, January 11, 1998

WELCOME

Samuel W. Smith (Washington State University): Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Please be seated. It is my pleasure to welcome you to the 33rd annual NCAA honors dinner.

Will you please remain seated during the invocation, which will be presented by Lawrence Carter, dean of the chapel of Morehouse College? After the invocation, please enjoy your dinner. Then we will be back with tonight's program.

INVOCATION

Lawrence Carter (Morehouse College): Let us pray.

O, for faith that will not tremble on the grain of any earth woe. It is in this faith, dear God, at this moment crowned with promise and high achievement, that we lift our gratitude to you for these disciplines committed by our pioneering athletes, scholars and social engineers, who took their preparation seriously and treated each assignment as a sacred duty and who impress in such a large number this evening promises to soar humanity higher than we have ever soared before, and promises to touch thousands of unborn generations, waiting now in the wings of eternity ready to be kissed by their success and built on their hard work.

For all of this bubbling potential and realized dream, we give Thee our humble but hearty thanks. We ask Thy special blessing for those honorees whose ecumenical excellence, sensitivity and prodigious output has earned for them the right to stand before these mentors as world ingenuity.

Forgive us for feasting while thousands starve. Let us not forget that blessed bread broken for ourselves should always need the bread of the world. Amen.

INTRODUCTIONS

Mr. Smith: Honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, I realize that some of you have not completed your meals at this time, but we have an exciting program this evening and I know you want to get to it. Please continue to enjoy your meal while I make some preliminary remarks and introductions.

I am glad to present these wonderful, honored guests who we have with us this evening.

The honors dinner annually permits us to reflect on the very positive values of intercollegiate athletics, positive values within the context of higher education. The current student-athletes we honor tonight represent the very best we have. They are the best in the programs that we have to offer and we also salute their accomplishments as students.

I am sure that every-day people in all walks of life ask themselves: "Why am I in this business?" Those of us who are in this room are no different. Ladies and gentlemen, tonight you are going to hear some remarkable stories. I submit to you that the individuals on this dais are the reasons why we do what we do. We take great pride in the successes of these current and former student-athletes because they prove that academics and athletics do

mix. They have excelled on the field and in the classroom. They have sacrificed from time to time to become role models for those who look up to them.

These individuals give us all the reasons we need to work hard to foster the best possible athletics environment on our campuses. They represent the numerous other student-athletes on our campuses who, through their hard work and dedication, epitomize truly the student-athlete model.

At this time, I would like to recognize a couple of individuals sharing the dais this evening. First is the chair of the NCAA honors committee, which is responsible for selecting our honorees and planning our program. She is the director of athletics at the University of Washington and a former president of NACDA, Barbara Hedges. Please, a round of applause. (Applause) Also, a person with whom I have worked very closely over the past couple of years, an individual who has been the guiding light in this time of change, the executive director of the NCAA, Ced Dempsey. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF MASTER OF CEREMONIES

Mr. Smith: Tonight's master of ceremonies was born in Toronto, Canada, and attended the University of Toronto, but through his work for CBS News, he might now be called truly a man of the world.

John Roberts began his broadcasting career as a veejay, but he soon switched to hard news.

He moved to Miami and then to CBS in New York before moving up to the network. He is currently anchor of CBS News "Sunday Edition," and contributes reports for the "CBS Evening News with Dan Rather," focusing on medical and health issues.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have the pleasure of introducing tonight's emcee, John Roberts of CBS News. John. (Applause)

INTRODUCTION OF TODAY'S TOP VIII

John Roberts: Through the traditions of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, I am embarrassed and red tonight. It is not true that I began as a veejay. I actually began reading farm reports in a 5,000-watt radio station in a little town called Owenstown, Ontario.

Thank you, Sam, for bringing back such wonderful memories. You did that to Harry Smith as well when you had a reel on his football career.

May I take this opportunity to welcome you all to the 33rd annual honors dinner and let me say what a pleasure is to be here. Because I was raised in Toronto, I did not have the opportunity to go to a school that was affiliated with the NCAA. So let me say what an honor in my adopted home it is to be invited to participate tonight in one of the premier events in an organization that truly has helped to define excellence in both academics and sports.

I am sure that you will join me in first congratulating all of our honorees this evening. The honorees have shown that it is possible through their hard work and discipline to succeed as a student and as an athlete. Anyone who went to college knows how difficult it is to just juggle course work, let alone participate in athletics at such an elite level and be involved in extracurricular and community activities. Through it all, they were maintaining a grade-point average in some cases that has put these students and these athletes at the very top of their class.

There are many more people out there who are not getting the recognition that you are tonight, but you folks truly are the best. I would also like to congratulate all of you out there—coaches and administrators, presidents—for showing the example and the leadership that all young people need to tru-

ly be their best. You are helping to mold them into future leaders and role models for the next generation. All right. Let's get to it.

Tonight's program gives the NCAA an opportunity to honor eight outstanding student-athletes from 1997 and six former athletes who have distinguished themselves in their chosen professions on their silver anniversary as college graduates.

Now, I take great pleasure in introducing the current student-athletes to you.

Lisa Coole, *University of Georgia, swimming.*

First of all, from right here in the "Peach Tree State" at the University of Georgia, please give a round of applause to Lisa Coole. (Applause)

This is the second time in three months that Lisa has received one of the NCAA's most coveted honors. Last October 19, Lisa Coole was named 1997 NCAA Woman of the Year for her ability to balance a superior career in athletics, excellence in the classroom and community service.

She is a Southeastern Conference and NCAA champion swimmer, demonstrating versatility with national placements in the butterfly, freestyle and relays. She won the 100-meter butterfly at the 1996 NCAA championships.

A biology major, Lisa is a first-team academic all-American, earning both NCAA and Southeastern Conference postgraduate scholarships. Her 3.62 grade-point average has earned her recognition as a Ramsey scholar, one of the top 10 scholar-athletes at the University of Georgia.

Lisa's service to the campus community includes membership in the Fellowship of Christian Athletes and Leadership UGA. She has not neglected the rest of Athens, regularly spending time as a volunteer in the local homeless shelter, reading to grade school children and contributing to Habitat for Humanity.

The NCAA woman of the year is truly a student-athlete for all seasons. We know from her acceptance speech in October that Lisa takes seriously her responsibility to set an example for others. I would say she is doing a great job.

Lisa will receive her reward from Glayda Horvat, associate director of athletics at Georgia.

Ladies and gentlemen, Lisa Coole, University of Georgia. (Applause)

Carrie Ferguson, *Capital University, basketball and volleyball.*

Our next honoree is from Capital University, in basketball and volleyball, Carrie Ferguson. (Applause)

This two-sport athlete's leadership abilities are easily recognized, as demonstrated by the long list of honors that she has received.

If Carrie Ferguson had to be described in one word, that word would be first. She was chosen first-team all-American in both basketball and volleyball, first-team academic all-American in both sports, top female scholar-athlete in the Ohio Athletic Conference, and graduated first in her class with a 3.96 grade-point average in psychology.

As a starting forward and two-year captain of the basketball team, Carrie helped lead Capital to two consecutive Division III national championships and one national third-place finish. As an outside hitter in volleyball, Carrie was chosen the team's most valuable player three times.

Leading two different varsity teams and keeping up with schoolwork is more than enough for most people, but Carrie seems compelled to share her abilities with others. She has found time to help out as a hospital volunteer, work at a homeless shelter and tutor second graders.

For her combination of athletics, academics and character, Carrie is the recipient of five scholarships, including an NCAA postgraduate scholarship. She will receive her award from Josiah Blackmore, president at Capital.

Ladies and gentlemen, Carrie Ferguson, Capital University. (Applause)

Brian Griese, *University of Michigan, football.*

To say that our next honoree had a pretty good year would certainly be an understatement. From the University of Michigan, in football, Brian Griese. (Applause)

Most children of a famous parent will agree that fame can either be a blessing or a curse, and sometimes both, particularly when the child's talents are expressed in or on the parent's field of glory. But Brian Griese's talents have provided a measure of fame that is all his own.

Like his father, Bob, Brian Griese plays quarterback for a well-known Big Ten football powerhouse, but Brian chose to be a Wolverine instead of a Boilermaker. In 1997, he was ranked the No. 1 college quarterback in the nation by the Associated Press, and has steadily worked his way up in Michigan's records book.

During Brian's journey to the top, he has demonstrated commitment and dedication to his teammates and to the university, striving to improve each year. After an injury to the starting quarterback, he started the final nine games of his sophomore year. He then accepted the role as backup during his junior year. As the backup, he did everything he could to help his team, holding for place kicks and serving as the "pooch punter." When he got the call in the final game of that season, at arch-rival Ohio State, he was ready, leading the Wolverines to victory over the second-ranked Buckeyes.

Brian's senior year has been storybook. He led Michigan to its first national championship in 50 years, capping off an undefeated season with an MVP performance in the Rose Bowl.

An international affairs major with a 3.36 grade-point average, he was selected academic all-Big Ten for the last three years. He was also named to numerous academic all-America teams, and is the recipient of the University of Michigan Academic Achievement Award. That is not a bad year at all.

Brian is a member of the Student-Athlete Community Service Committee, sharing himself regularly with hospital and elementary-school visits.

Though they are not the first members of the same family to be honored at an honors dinner, Bob and Brian are the first parent-child honorees. Bob received a Silver Anniversary Award in 1992.

Brian will receive his award from Tom Goss, director of athletics at Michigan.

Ladies and gentlemen, Brian Griese, University of Michigan. (Applause)

Kasey Morlock, *North Dakota State University, basketball.*

Our fourth honoree of the evening is from North Dakota State University in basketball, Kasey Morlock. (Applause)

Kasey's performances on the basketball court have truly been electrifying as we will see, but she also keeps up on "current" events in the classroom in more ways than one.

Kasey Morlock has played on three consecutive NCAA Division II women's basketball championship teams, so you might say she has a "lock" on what it takes to be the best. She definitely has a lock on the North Central Conference scoring title. She is her school's first basketball player, male or female, to score 2,000 points.

Kasey has a 3.32 grade-point average and a degree in electrical engineering.

Her combination of grades, athletics ability and campus and community leadership prompted her selection as North Dakota State's top student-athlete. She is only the second student-athlete from the school to earn academic all-American honors, and she was the state winner for North Dakota for the 1997 NCAA Woman of the Year.

In all the "spare" time that she has, Kasey teaches Sunday school, works as a counselor at an annual math and science workshop, and serves as spokesperson for the annual community blood drive.

Kasey will receive her award from Lynn Dorn, director of women's athletics at North Dakota State. Ladies and gentlemen, Kasey Morlock, North Dakota State University. (Applause)

Obadele Thompson, *University of Texas at El Paso, track and field.*

I don't know about you, but only four honorees in the program and I am feeling an inadequacy inside of me. Some of these folks have done more in four years than many of us have done in the past 20 to 25. It is only going to get worse rather than better.

Our fifth honoree is Obadele Thompson from the University of Texas at El Paso, track and field. (Applause)

This is a young man who you are going to hear a lot about, particularly in the year 2000. This three-time NCAA champion is not only fleet-footed but nimble-minded as well.

Obadele Thompson is the newest star in the bright track and field universe at UTEP. He is the 1997 NCAA outdoor 100-meters champion, and won the indoor 200 meters in both 1996 and 1997.

He is no slowpoke when it comes to international competition. Thompson is the current world record holder at 55 meters, and only wind prevented his 9.69 from going into the record book.

In the classroom, his feet may be still, but his mind must be racing. He registered a 3.89 grade-point average as a double-major in marketing and economics. Thompson was named to the dean's list four straight years.

Obadele's honors are numerous. Among them are selection to academic and USA track and field all-America teams, election to Beta Gamma Sigma as one of the top business students in the United States, and selection as the UTEP athlete of the year.

Obadele is a speaker for the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, provided leadership as captain of the track team as a junior and senior, and volunteers his time with local church youth groups in El Paso.

Obadele will receive his award from Dr. Diana Natalicio, president at UTEP.

Ladies and gentlemen, the person who you will probably soon consider the fastest man on earth, Obadele Thompson, University of Texas at El Paso. (Applause) Sydney in the year 2000? There is a lot I could say.

Meredith Willard, *University of Alabama, gymnastics.*

Our sixth honoree this evening is from the University of Alabama.

Let me tell you, this is not the first time that Meredith Willard has shared a dais with Lisa Coole. Last October, Meredith was among the 10 finalists for the 1997 NCAA Woman of the Year Award.

Meredith Willard has made a major contribution to the University of Alabama gymnastics program during her four-year career. And that is no small feat. Alabama is consistently one of the NCAA powerhouses in the sport.

She was the only individual to reach the finals of all four events at the 1997 NCAA championships, and as a junior, she won the NCAA all-around

title. She received honors as the Southeastern Conference gymnast of the year and the Alabama athlete of the year. Meredith was also a silver medalist at the 1997 World University Games.

Meredith earned a degree in marketing with a 3.94 grade-point average, several postgraduate scholarships, and election to no fewer than six national honor societies. As president of the university's student-athlete advisory board, Meredith helped direct community outreach efforts, worked with "Meals on Wheels" and a program for the children of prison inmates.

Meredith will receive her award from Dr. Andrew A. Sorensen, president at Alabama.

Ladies and gentlemen, Meredith Willard, University of Alabama. (Applause)
Grant Wistrom, *University of Nebraska, Lincoln, football.*

Our next honoree for the evening is from the University of Nebraska, Grant Wistrom. (Applause)

Grant is a fellow who is accustomed to winning during his career at Nebraska. The team lost only two games. Just about a week ago, he ended his career on a high note, helping the undefeated Huskers to an Orange Bowl win and a share of the national championship.

Grant Wistrom tackles every obstacle he faces, especially on the playing field. The Husker cocaptain is the all-time career leader in tackles for loss at Nebraska, and ranks fifth on the career list in sacks with 19.

He won the 1997 Lombardi Award, given to the nation's top lineman. He was first-team all-America his junior and senior years, and was twice named Big 12 defensive player of the year.

Grant also has the academic side of the student-athlete equation figured out. He has recorded a 3.4 grade-point average while earning a degree in biological sciences. He is a National Football Foundation postgraduate scholarship winner, and is a two-time GTE academic all-American.

Grant was named to the college of arts and sciences dean's list seven semesters. He is a member of the Husker community outreach program, speaking at local public schools.

We wonder where he finds the time for anything other than his studies and his sport. But he does. He was named to the Brook Berringer Citizenship Team in 1997 in recognition of extensive and outstanding community involvement.

Grant will receive his award from Tom Osborne, former—did I say former—you will have to get used to that, the former head football coach at Nebraska.

Ladies and gentlemen, Grant Wistrom, University of Nebraska. (Applause)
"Former" is going to be a tough one to get used to.

Peyton Manning, *University of Tennessee, football.*

Our eighth and final honoree this evening, from the University of Tennessee, in football, Peyton Manning.

Peyton Manning, like Brian Griese, inherited a football legacy from his father, former Mississippi quarterback Archie Manning. Peyton, too, has risen admirably to the challenge of following in famous footsteps.

When Peyton Manning decided to return to the University of Tennessee for his senior season, Volunteer fans were understandably overjoyed. His value to the Vols was proven. After earning Southeastern Conference freshman of the year honors, Peyton threw for more than 6,000 yards and 42 touchdowns during his sophomore and junior seasons.

Peyton didn't slow down this year, either. The first-team all-American led

Tennessee to a No. 3 national ranking and a spot in the Orange Bowl, throwing for more than 3,800 yards and 36 touchdowns. In the storied history of the SEC, no one has thrown for more yards than Peyton Manning.

Peyton has not neglected the other areas of his life. He graduated in December cum laude and No. 1 in the speech communication department with a 3.56 grade-point average, and posted a 3.50 GPA while earning a graduate degree in sports administration. He is one of only 18 students nationwide to receive a 1997 National Football Foundation fellowship grant for graduate study.

That is not all. Peyton is also active in the DARE program, educating youngsters about the dangers of drug use. He also leads elementary school reading programs, and was recently awarded an NCAA postgraduate scholarship.

Peyton will receive his award from Dr. Joseph Johnson, president at Tennessee.

Ladies and gentlemen, Peyton Manning, University of Tennessee. (Applause)

I would like to invite Peyton Manning to respond on behalf of all eight of the student-athletes. Peyton.

Mr. Manning: Thank you. My father always told me that public speaking would be a very humbling experience.

I was home in New Orleans this past week when a good friend of mine called me and asked me how much I would charge to come speak to his Boy Scouts troop. I said, "Chip, you and I have been friends for a long time, and besides I wouldn't think of charging you to come to speak to a group of Boy Scouts." He said, "Hey, Peyton, that is great. We will save our money and get a better speaker next year." (Laughter)

The eight student-athletes are here to be honored for the significant and also difficult choices we made throughout our college years, decisions and ramifications that also set us apart from both our classmates and our teammates. It is traditional to thank the NCAA for this honor. However, I would rather not.

What I believe is more appropriate is to thank our institutions and all of you for the opportunity to be athletes and the life lessons athletics taught us. It is popular today to ask if big-time college sports are even compatible with higher education.

The critics ask if athletics are consistent with the educational missions of colleges and universities. Frankly, those people see the walls that limit us without seeing the spaces that allow us to expand. The reality is that collegiate sports have a lot more to do with learning than they do with winning.

As student-athletes, we learn more than most people. The blessings of lasting pleasure of camaraderie and shared sacrifice, collective responsibility and commitment to excellence, and time management and life management. It would have been easy to have been a football player and not a student, and conversely, it would be much easier to have been just a student and left football for some other day in time.

But it wouldn't have been as joyous, as rich or, quite candidly, as humbling to have been one without the other. I would bet you that each and everyone of tonight's honorees would say without hesitation that he or she is a better man or woman and a better leader because of those experiences.

So for all of us, I say thank you from the bottom of my heart, not for a single award or a single night, but for the many memorable and momentous

moments that we have had the privilege to call ourselves student-athletes. God bless you. (Applause)

Mr. Roberts: Thank you, Peyton. Give one more big round of applause for these eight student-athlete honorees.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

SILVER ANNIVERSARY HONOREES

Mr. Roberts: Now, let's meet this year's Silver Anniversary honorees.

Gary Hall, Indiana University, swimming.

I think it is safe to say we usually don't associate the state of Indiana with water. However, tonight we have not just one, but two Hoosier honorees whose claims to fame are aquatic. Let's meet the first.

Gary Hall is no stranger to NCAA honors. When what is now the Top VIII award was called the Today's Top V a quarter of a century ago, he was one of the winners and the recipient of a postgraduate scholarship. It is not hard to imagine why when you look at his collegiate career.

Indiana won four NCAA swimming titles, partly on the strength of Hall's seven individual championships. At the risk of numbing you with numbers, it must be reported that he set nine individual world records in three different events from 1968 to 1972, earning recognition as world swimmer of the year in 1969 and 1970.

Hall was the second man in U.S. history to swim on three Olympic teams, serving as captain of the 1972 and 1976 Olympic swim squads. He won silver medals in 1968 and 1972, and had the honor of carrying the flag in the opening ceremonies in 1976.

Gary Hall was also a man with vision, literally. After graduation from Indiana, he attended medical school to become an ophthalmologist, specializing in eye surgery.

However, one of his proudest moments must have been seeing his son, Gary Jr., compete in the 1996 Olympics.

Currently working as director of the Gary Hall Eye Surgery Institute, he is the author of four books on eyesight. Hall serves as a spokesperson for the National Society to Prevent Blindness and has assisted with efforts to fight diabetes and muscular dystrophy.

Gary will receive his award from Clarence Doninger, athletics director at Indiana.

Ladies and gentlemen, Gary Hall, Indiana University. (Applause)

Lawrie Mifflin, Yale University, field hockey.

Our next honoree is from Yale University in field hockey, Lawrie Mifflin. (Applause)

The name Lawrie Mifflin is synonymous with the word "pioneer." If you looked up the word "pioneer" in your dictionary, it would say ... well, never mind. Let's meet Lawrie and you will see what I mean.

Lawrie Mifflin's life has been a life of "firsts." She was a member of the first Yale class to include women. She was the first captain of the first women's varsity sports team, field hockey. In fact, she started the team.

After graduating magna cum laude, Mifflin began a career as a journalist. She became the first female sportswriter for the New York Daily News, and covered the 1976 World Series. She was a beat reporter for the NHL's New York Rangers, one of the first women to cover the league. Working the hockey league included covering the 1980 Lake Placid Miracle on Ice.

In 1982, Mifflin moved to the New York Times where she covered the 1984

Olympics. After three years as a sports reporter, she became deputy sports editor for the Times, serving in that capacity for five years. She also found time to contribute as associate producer for ABC's "Sports Beat With Howard Cosell," and was a guest on numerous cable television shows.

Currently, a culture reporter for the New York Times, Lawrie has worked as the national education editor and as creator and director of the paper's work life services office, responsible for formulating and promoting flexible work policies, which anybody who works in New York knows are essential. She is a founding member of the association for women in sports media.

Lawrie will receive her award from Barbara Chesler, associate athletics director at Yale.

Ladies and gentlemen, Lawrie Mifflin, Yale University. (Applause)

Cynthia Potter, *Indiana University, diving.*

Our third Silver Anniversary honoree of the evening is from Indiana University in diving, Cynthia Potter.

Each year the Silver Anniversary award winners are selected from a "pool" of candidates. Keep that in mind as we present this evening's second honoree from the Hoosier state.

Cynthia Potter shares with Gary Hall the distinction of selection to several Olympic teams, diving for the United States in 1968, '72, '76 and earning a berth on the 1980 team. She won a bronze medal on the three-meter board in 1976. At Indiana from 1970 to 1972, she won world diver of the year honors. During her career, she won a total of 28 national diving championships.

Potter has remained closely connected to her sport. She has worked as a television commentator for several networks since 1983, including providing commentary for the Olympics, NCAA championships and the Goodwill Games. She has served on virtually every committee as an athlete or coach for United States diving, the national governing body.

She has also imparted her knowledge and experience to young athletes as the diving coach at Southern Methodist University and at the University of Arizona. She was named Pacific-10 Conference coach of the year in 1993.

Cynthia is active in civic causes, volunteering for United Way efforts, at children's and veterans administration hospitals, and for the Special Olympics, as well as the fight against illiteracy.

Cynthia will receive her award from Mary Ann Rohleder, associate director of athletics at Indiana University. Ladies and gentlemen, Cynthia Potter, Indiana University. (Applause)

Sally Ride, *Stanford University, tennis*

Our next honoree, from Stanford University, is a tennis star who literally reached for the stars, Sally Ride. (Applause)

We doubt that Sally Ride needs any introduction to anyone who is over the age of 12, but you may not be aware of everything that this woman has accomplished.

Sally Ride gained worldwide fame as the first American woman in space, but as an undergraduate at Stanford, her recognition in athletics came as the No. 1 singles player on the varsity tennis team.

After receiving bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees from Stanford, Sally Ride was selected by NASA for astronaut training in 1978. She made history as a member of the five-person Challenger space shuttle crew that orbited for six days in June 1983. The mission included the first satellite

deployment and retrieval with the shuttle's robot arm as well as pharmaceutical research.

Ride made a second shuttle flight on Challenger in October 1984. It was an eight-day mission, where her experience using the shuttle's robot arm was put to good use.

Ride shared her experiences through the publication of three books on the wonders of space flight. She has twice been awarded the national spaceflight medal.

In 1989, Sally joined the faculty at the University of California, San Diego, where she is a professor of physics and the director of the California Space Institute.

Sally will receive her award from Ted Leland, athletics director at Stanford. Ladies and gentlemen, Sally Ride, Stanford University. (Applause)

Harry Smith, *Central College (Iowa), football.*

Our next honoree is a man who is very familiar to me from Central College in football, Harry Smith. (Applause)

Not only is he familiar to me, but familiar to all of you, and not just for his talents at playing the tuba. We have invited him into our homes for more than a decade through the medium of television. Anyone who is here that was at the honors dinner three years ago will remember the admirable job that he did during the 1995 honors dinner.

Harry Smith's college career is remarkable for the range of activities he managed to squeeze into four years. He was a three-year starter at defensive tackle for the Central College football team. He hosted his own radio show; had roles in several campus theater productions; was a soloist in the a cappella choir; served as a residence hall advisor; was a member of the campus church board; and, appropriately, was a member of the Beta Kappa Epsilon social fraternity.

After graduation, Harry worked in radio in Denver and Cincinnati before moving into television. He signed on with CBS as a news correspondent in 1986. He became coanchor of "CBS This Morning" in 1987, and has covered major news stories throughout the world.

Smith served as cohost of CBS sports weekday morning coverage of the 1992 and 1994 Olympic Winter Games.

Currently, Smith is a correspondent with CBS News. He produces "Travels With Harry," a weekly feature on the "CBS Evening News," and is a frequent contributor to "48 Hours" and "CBS News Sunday Morning."

He is an alternate anchor for those programs and regularly hosts documentaries for the History Channel and the Arts & Entertainment network's "Biography" series.

Harry Smith frequently volunteers his time as a host for fund-raising events for the Salvation Army in New York City as well as the annual Free Concert for Peace each New Year's Eve from the cathedral of St. John the Divine.

Harry will receive his award from Dr. David Rowe, president of Central College.

Ladies and gentlemen, Harry Smith, Central College. (Applause)

Drew Pearson, *University of Tulsa, football.*

Our sixth and final Silver Anniversary honoree this evening, from the University of Tulsa in football, Drew Pearson. (Applause)

Drew Pearson actually began his football career as a high-school quar-

terback. He played that role at Tulsa until he moved to wide receiver prior to his junior season. It was something that proved to be a wise move.

In just two seasons as a receiver, Pearson caught 55 passes, eight of them for touchdowns. The thing that made him special, though, was his 20-yards-per-catch average.

After graduation, Pearson signed with the Dallas Cowboys as a free agent. In 11 seasons with the Cowboys, he played on three Super Bowl teams, was selected to play in the Pro Bowl three times, and was named to the all-decade team of the 1970s by the Pro Football Hall of Fame. Fans voted him the Cowboy's NFL man of the year in 1980.

After his football career ended, Pearson became a star of the business world. He is chairman of the board of Drew Pearson Marketing in Dallas, a \$50 million company that manufactures and distributes officially licensed sports and character headware. His company was named "company of the year" in 1994 by Black Enterprise magazine and continues to be one of the top black-owned businesses in the country.

Drew served on a number of civic organizations in the Dallas area, as well as the NFL commissioner's former players advisory committee.

His award tonight is a kind of reunion with his Dallas Cowboys teammate, quarterback Roger Staubach. Roger was a Silver Anniversary Award winner back in 1990.

Drew will receive his award from Judy McCloud, athletics director at Tulsa. Ladies and gentlemen, Drew Pearson, University of Tulsa.

I would like to ask Drew to come to the podium to respond on behalf of all of the Silver Anniversary award winners.

Mr. Pearson: That is me, the guy with all that hair. (Laughter) I would have paid them not to have shown that (video). Anyway, I thank you. It is indeed an honor for me to be here tonight to receive this most distinguished NCAA Silver Anniversary award. To be a part of this year's class that includes Gary Hall, Lawrie Mifflin, Cynthia Potter, Sally Ride and Harry Smith certainly makes this award even more special to me.

To all of the Silver Anniversary honorees, I have enjoyed my time here in Atlanta and I am truly honored to have this opportunity to respond on your behalf. I will try to do my best to do justice to what this award means to all of us.

When I look at the very distinguished list of past honorees, being selected for this award is even more special. After reviewing the past list of recipients, I was glad but certainly not surprised to see that four of my former teammates who were with the Dallas Cowboys have also received such recognition—Bob Lilly, Lee Roy Jordan, Roger Staubach and Calvin Hill.

I am also honored and proud to have my mother, Minnie Pearson-Skaggs, and her husband, Walter, with me tonight, along with my two daughters—Torrie, a college graduate; and Brittany, a current college student. I wanted to mention that because I am very proud of both of them. That beam of light you have been seeing for the last two days comes from a proud mother who is just glad to see her son finally hanging around with some good people—like educators, people like Bob Dole and other dignitaries and honorees at this head table.

I also want to thank the University of Tulsa's athletics director, Judy McCloud and the football coach, Dave Rader, for their support in being here this evening.

Now, for all of the honorees, it was a very special experience for us to be

an NCAA student-athlete. Student-athletes are special people. Are we better than anyone else? I don't think so, but we are special because everyone can't handle the academic and athletics demands that are placed upon student-athletes.

The rigors of maintaining academic excellence and the pressure of performing athletically is not for everyone. But because we are able to do it as student-athletes, it is like our college experience provided us with the opportunity to acquire a double or dual education for the price of one.

The academic experience gave us the chance to gain knowledge and qualify ourselves to pursue opportunities to make a living in our lives beyond college. But athletics gave us a chance to live out the real experiences that life has to offer. Athletics taught us all how to deal with the wins and losses, to set goals and make sacrifices and pursue those goals. It taught us how to work with other people and the value of teamwork. It taught us that education is not limited to the classroom. It takes place in the kitchen, it takes place on the corner, or it takes place in the garage or walking to your destination. It takes place while you listen or speak to others. It also takes place on the fields, the court, the track or the swimming pool. Education springs forth from everywhere. It derives it from tragedy, it derives it from joy, it derives it from victory, it derives it from suffering. Education does not take place when you learn something you did not know before.

Education is your ability to use what you have learned to be better today than you were yesterday. No matter how much you know or how much you have learned, the ultimate goal of education is to give you greater insight into yourself.

These student-athletes were able to use the courts, the fields, the pools and training grounds for what we have learned academically. When we view our lives at sporting contests, we learn to go with limitations and we learn how to overcome obstacles that are dealt us and find ways to make it through the event in good form and with positive feelings.

As student-athletes, the education we gained from our respective colleges and universities turned out to be our passports to the future. We all know the future belongs to those who prepare for it. The academic and athletics experience of college and college athletics not only helps all of us to prepare for today, but it also helps us to prepare for yesterday and will continue to help us prepare for tomorrow.

So on behalf of the class of 1998 Silver Anniversary honorees, we say thank you, NCAA, for bestowing this recognition upon us. Our commitment to you is that we will continue to live up to the high standards that go along with such recognition. We will continue to serve professionally and continue to serve in these civic endeavors as student-athletes of the NCAA. We accept our place as role models, but not for the current students and athletes to follow in our footsteps, but to create their own footprints knowing that if we can do it, so can you. Thank you. We are very honored as the class of 1998 Silver Anniversary honorees. God bless you all. (Applause)

Mr. Roberts: Thank you, Drew. Let's give one more big round of applause for all of our Silver Anniversary honorees.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

AWARD OF VALOR

Mr. Roberts: Congratulations to all of you. You have all made us proud. The NCAA Award of Valor may be presented to a coach or administrator, or

to a current or former varsity letter-winner at an NCAA institution who, when confronted with a situation involving personal danger, averted or minimized potential disaster by courageous action or noteworthy bravery.

The NCAA Award of Valor has only been presented six previous times, the last being in 1984 to honor Joe Delaney, a former football student-athlete at Northwestern State University who gave up his own life in an attempt to save several youngsters from drowning.

Tonight, we honor Shannon Smith, a football player from the University of Hawaii, another special person who also died saving a child from drowning. The child in this instance was the 6-year-old son of his football coach.

The nomination form for the Award of Valor defines valor as the strength of mind or spirit that enables a person to brave danger with boldness and firmness. Shannon Shea Smith, a football student-athlete at the University of Hawaii, Manoa, demonstrated strength of mind and spirit in many ways during his life.

Shannon has been described as a son to be proud of, a best friend to his brothers and sisters, a loving uncle, and a supportive friend and teammate. When Shannon gave up his life March 29, 1997, to save the life of Cody vonAppen, he left the best legacy a human can leave, that of love.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Award of Valor is now presented to Shannon's mother, Rosemary Smith. (Applause)

Mrs. Smith: Thank you. I have just been overwhelmed by you guys. On behalf of Shannon and the entire family, I wish to thank the NCAA and the Honors Committee and Mr. Marchiony for arranging the transportation and for bestowing this very distinguished honor.

As a parent, having suffered a great loss, this is compounded by the thought that Shannon is not forgotten. The NCAA has let Shannon take a deserving place in history and I appreciate that. I have great strength from being here and I will treasure it.

It is a tragedy that he will never fulfill his dream to play for the NFL and to become a chiropractor, to get married and have six children. He would not have had it any other way. The outcome is what Shannon would have wanted. Many people in publications have written about Shannon.

He was an ordinary kid who has become extraordinary. He was something to be proud of and a good friend of all. He had a great sense of humor and constant smile. For those of you who were not fortunate enough to have met this young man, please allow me a moment to share Shannon with you.

He was our youngest son and a gifted athlete with a sport that he took on and did well. He glowed in shining with others. In soccer, he would make sure that the teammates could score and get the credit. He would give up the time to teach others in soccer.

If he passed you on the street, he just didn't say "hi" to you. He would stop and would not let you just keep on walking, he wanted to know how you really were. He stopped to talk on a one-on-one basis and take it further by stopping and talking to them.

His friend had a special form of cancer and none of his friends would come by to see him anymore. Shannon did. He stopped every afternoon to play chess with him. Shannon attended Winter's camp, which were team and leadership camps, and he was asked if he could become a counselor. In one of the sessions, there was an autistic boy who had never spoken to anyone in his life. Shannon made it a personal challenge to communicate with him.

The problem is Frank would crawl under the table. Shannon would crawl under the table and have a conversation with him.

One day, he came flying out from under the table and yelled to everyone, "Frank talked to me." Nobody would believe him. At the end of the camp, Shannon convinced Frank to walk up on the stage for his parents, and Frank talked to all the parents. Everyone in the crowd, even Shannon, had tears in their eyes.

In early morning, Shannon would get up at the camp to run and the kids that they gave him would start running with him. He had a saying that you have "got to love it." The kids fought for a chance to share the ball with him.

He was loved by all and they trusted him, and they knew he loved them. Shannon received a special thanks at Winter's camp and he was so moved by it and so inspired that he made copies of it and kept it in his loose-leaf binder at high school. In college, he framed it and had it in his room. He handwrote it and sent it to a friend. He said he felt the world would be a better place if the world lives by this: "May we talk about love, life and discuss victory of others that will last forever. Those who cheat, will be cheated. Those who slander will be slandered. For every lie you tell, you will be lied to. Brutality will meet with brutality, and we get what we give and to the same degree. Not only do we reach the same people with whom we dealt, somewhere, sometime, some little treat shall in a like manner. The good that we do to others will return also to us. For your kindness to strangers, you will receive hospitality. Understand the troubles of others who come to you with their soul bared, and when you cry yourself, you will be better understood. We get what we give. Life always attracts life. This is the law and it is inevitable. We cannot escape our actions. We get what we give."

We found Shannon's journal. It was unusual for a boy his age, but this is the very last entry in his journal: "I am grateful for my life. The way I live, where I live and how I live is all perfect to me. I love my lifestyle and I wouldn't want to change it. I always hear people complaining about everything and say they don't miss the poor lifestyle they live in. I am grateful for what I have. Some people, though, don't realize what they have and they take it all for granted. They complain about what they don't have instead of praising what they do have. Everyone in life has something to be happy about."

At Shannon's memorial service, Father Bruce said: "First, we die in a physical sense. Second, we die when everyone who knows you on earth dies. Third, we die when anything good that you did stops going on."

I ask you all to try to remember Shannon in goodness and to keep it going. I feel like I was touched by an angel. Thank you.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

THEODORE ROOSEVELT AWARD

Mr. Roberts: Thank you.

From one profile in courage to another. It is time now for us to turn our attention to the focal point of each honors program—the presentation of the Theodore Roosevelt Award, the highest honor the Association bestows on an individual.

Your program includes pictures of past winners of this award, which recognizes a distinguished citizen who, having earned a varsity athletics award in college, has exemplified the ideals and purposes to which college athletics is dedicated.

It is a distinguished group, including, as you will note, former presidents,

military leaders and pioneers in space and medicine. Without a doubt, all of these individuals have earned this recognition.

The nomination form for the 1998 Theodore Roosevelt Award winner lists his occupation as "attorney at law," a description that falls far short of truly defining his life. This is a life far better defined by the word "servant," for he has always been dedicated to the service of his country.

In 1941, when Bob Dole left his now famous hometown of Russell, Kansas, to attend the University of Kansas, his goal was to complete a premed curriculum, enter the university's medical school and become a doctor. At 6-1, 195 pounds, he also hoped to play basketball for legendary coach Phog Allen.

Dole rose early each morning to run and lift weights, training that would later be valuable to him in a way he had not anticipated.

He realized his basketball dream and also competed on the football and track teams. Everything was progressing according to plan. But on December 7, 1941, the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and Bob Dole's life and plans were altered forever.

The 19-year-old joined the U.S. Army's enlisted reserve corps, where he served while completing two years of school at Kansas.

Lieutenant Dole was assigned to the infantry 10th mountain division. In combat in Northern Italy in 1945, he was severely wounded attempting to rescue his radio man. He then endured nine operations and 38 months of hospitalization. His military decorations included the Bronze Star and two Purple Hearts.

For many people, that would have been achievement enough. For Bob Dole, it was only the beginning. He realized that his injuries would preclude a career in medicine, so he changed his goals and began the study of law. In 1952, seven years after being gravely wounded, Dole earned a joint bachelor of arts and law degree, graduating magna cum laude from Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas. He return to Russell and ran successfully for county attorney, winning reelection to the post three times.

At age 27, he won a seat in the Kansas House of Representatives. Dole was elected to Congress in 1960, where he served for eight years. Then it was on to the Senate in 1968 for the first of five terms. He served as chairman of the Republican National Committee in 1971 and '72, and was selected as Gerald Ford's vice-presidential running mate in 1976. He was named chair of the Senate Finance Committee in 1981, elected Senate majority leader in 1984 and again in 1994, the longest-serving Republican leader of the United States Senate in history.

Bob Dole resigned from the Senate in 1996 to run for president of the United States, and received the Republican nomination.

In 1997, this lifelong public servant was awarded the nation's highest civilian honor—the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Since his retirement from the political arena, Bob has expanded his horizons, showing us his wit and humility.

Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome the recipient of the 1998 Theodore Roosevelt Award, Senator Robert J. "Bob" Dole.

[The assembly extended a prolonged standing ovation.]

Mr. Smith: Senator Dole, in recognition of your superb undergraduate career as a student and an athlete, and your continuing commitment to the highest personal standards, this award is presented to you for a lifetime of contributions to this country, first as a heroic platoon leader in World War II, then through nearly a half-century of leadership as one of the most respect-

ed political figures and statesmen of our time. Ladies and gentlemen, Senator Bob Dole. (Applause)

Mr. Dole: I am very proud to be here. I want to thank all the recipients and special recognition to the Smiths, Mrs. Smith directly in front of me. I'll just add that this slide is from "Saturday Night Live."

I know that receiving this award would probably be every student-athlete's dream, and this is something I will cherish.

As John mentioned, I went back to some of the former recipients. My hero, Dwight Eisenhower, was the first recipient. I think the president from Abilene in many ways emulated Teddy Roosevelt in his love of sports and his brand of politics. Although it must be said that President Eisenhower's golf game was a good deal less strenuous than a typical day in the Roosevelt White House.

The historians tell of the day the French ambassador to the United States was invited to join T. R. for two sets of tennis. After the game, the president suggested jogging around the White House a few times, followed by a workout with the medicine ball. Finally, he turned to the exhausted guest and asked, "What would you like to do now?" He said, "If it is just the same to you, Mr. President, I would like to lie down and die." (Laughter) Well, T. R. is probably made of sturdier stuff. He always believed in going hard at everything, which explained his 100-mile horseback rides through the Virginia countryside, not to mention the Panama Canal, the Nobel Peace Prize and the "Square Deal."

After all this time, Theodore Roosevelt was no stranger to tragedy. He lost his wife and mother on the same terrible day. He saw his son die in enemy fire in the first world war. His political standard dimmed after he left the White House. He lost as many elections as he won.

In the most important of life's tests, he was undefeated. Theodore Roosevelt understood the heart of the nation is not to be found in its gross national products, or to be measured by the pollsters.

Every four years, candidates for president like to ask: "Are you better off than you were four years ago?" Instead of asking: "Are we better off?" perhaps we should be asking the Roosevelt question: "Are we better?" Do we demand as much of ourselves? Do we care as much about others? Are we willing to make necessary sacrifices for our children and the country we love? Can we summon the discipline on the playing fields and the vision of the statesmen? Therein lies the challenge for ourselves and for succeeding generations to emulate T. R. in making life a greater venture where competition is fierce but also honorable and sportsmanship is not defined on the playing field.

In the end, T. R. said it himself best. All his courage and character was summoned in the advice he gave some student-athletes when he said, "Don't flinch, don't foul and hit the line hard." Here is to the strenuous life, crowded, purposeful, generous and great, the legacy of Theodore Roosevelt, the essence of the NCAA, and the crowning measure of what it means to be an American. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Senator Dole.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to recognize two individuals from the institutions that Senator Dole has represented so well. First, James Concannon, dean of the law school at Washburn University. Jim, will you please stand and be recognized. (Applause)

And my friend, Robert Hemenway, chancellor of the University of Kansas. Bob, will you please stand and be recognized? (Applause)

Congratulations, Senator.

Mr. Roberts: I would have to say this has been quite an evening with the NCAA. As I was saying earlier this evening, when you look at the talent that has been assembled before you, this probably goes down in history as the best honors dinner ever. Again, congratulations to all of you.

It is terrific all of you took time from your busy schedules this week to recognize these individuals, all of whom truly epitomize the values of intercollegiate athletics. I am truly honored for the invitation to be a part of this night. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Smith: Thank you, John, for the terrific job you did in helping us pay tribute to these outstanding honorees. It is always good to be with you and we certainly appreciate the time you have taken to be here tonight.

We did something a little different as far as compensation for the emcee tonight. As a token of our appreciation, the NCAA will make a donation to your alma mater, the University of Toronto. I think both you and the University of Toronto deserve a round of applause. (Applause)

We always hate to see this evening close, not just because we have to get down to business now, but because the dinner makes us feel so good about what we do. I want to thank you and say "thank you" to all the award winners, all those who have been involved in this whole production. You make us very proud to be a part of the student-athletes and the student-athletes associated with the NCAA.

We will be dismissed after Dr. Lawrence Carter presents the benediction.

BENEDICTION

Dr. Carter: Life is the world in peace. Have courage. Hold on to what is good. Return no one evil for evil. Strengthen the faint-hearted; support the weak. Help the suffering. Honor everyone. Love and serve truth. Rejoicing in the power of the Holy Spirit and in the strong and perfect name of the Almighty. Amen.

[The honors dinner was concluded at 9:35 p.m.]

■ Division I Business Session

Monday Morning, January 12, 1998

The Division I forums were called to order at 8:30 a.m., by Robert A. Bowlsby, University of Iowa.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Bowlsby: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Bob Bowlsby. I serve the Association as the chair of the Division I Management Council. This morning it is my pleasure to welcome you and to introduce our keynote speaker, Dr. Donna Shalala, United States Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Secretary Shalala was sworn into President Clinton's Cabinet in January 1993. She leads a staff of more than 59,000 employees and manages a budget in excess of \$354 billion annually. As secretary, she supervises many, many programs, leads a very diverse group and manages virtually all of our country's federal welfare programs and children's programs. Included among these are a couple of small ventures known as Medicare and Medicaid. She is widely recognized as an expert on public/private partnerships, and she has employed her significant abilities in a variety of roles through the years.

Prior to her current challenges as secretary, she served as chancellor of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, where she led one of America's largest public research institutions. Through the years, she has been very supportive of intercollegiate athletics and all that goes with it, including, I am told, going so far as to offer the use of the chancellor's residence at the University of Wisconsin for coach Barry Alvarez and his family while they were waiting for their new home to be completed.

She had planned to be out of the country for an extended period of time, but unfortunately, her trip to Asia was canceled and she and coach Alvarez and his family shared the chancellor's residence for a period of time, causing Barry to respond to a question at the Big Ten football media luncheon: "How is your relationship with your new president and your new chancellor?" To which he responded: "It is wonderful. We have coffee every morning."

While at Wisconsin, she was very influential in the Big Ten and NCAA activities, and took an active role in the inclusion and integration of Penn State into the Big Ten. She is also remembered as a CEO who advocated for a small exercise facility in the Big Ten complex. That facility today bears a picture of her on the wall with the notation "Big Ten Secretary of Health." She has very little spare time, obviously, with her many worldwide duties, but in her spare time she is a very good mountain climber, tennis player and cross country skier. She is an athlete herself, and an advocate for young male and female athletes of all shapes, sizes and competitive levels.

Please join me in providing a very warm welcome for Secretary Donna Shalala. (Applause)

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Ms. Shalala: Thank you very much, Bob. I appreciate that introduction. Actually, I think the story about Barry that he tells is that it went around the room in the Big Ten and everyone was moaning and groaning about their

president. When they got to Barry Alvarez and said: "How is it going with your chancellor?" He said: "Heck, I am living with her." (Laughter)

Let me thank Bob and Cedric Dempsey for the invitation to be here. Let me note the presence of our regional director, Pat Ford-Roegner, and, in particular, the presence of my good friend, Ken Shaw, who hired me at Wisconsin when he was president of the system. They don't get better than him. I really enjoyed working with him at Wisconsin.

In case you were wondering, the job I have now is much easier than leading a great university. I also work for a sports fan. No President in American history has followed the fortunes of women and men on Division I teams more than President Clinton. He is widely knowledgeable, and if you get to his office on a Monday morning, you better have been watching the games over the weekend because you will end up in a very detailed discussion about what happened in college sports, in particular.

Twice in my life I interviewed for a university presidency in Division I. Once, I was rejected and once I got the job. Each time, I had the distinct impression that everyone on the search committee was seeking but didn't have enough nerve to say: "Can she talk to the coaches?"

Like everyone who cares about the NCAA, I have followed the debates over the change in governance. What is most important about the change is that you are looking toward the future. That is crucial because we both know that for the NCAA to ensure credibility and equality and stability in intercollegiate athletics in the 21st century, the game plan can't be business as usual.

Strategy on the field changes over time and strategy off the field must do the same. At a time of tight revenues, of high expectations from trustees and alumni and fans, the sea of money for corporations and agents, you need all of your skill and commitment and integrity to keep young people performing both athletically and academically.

I know better than perhaps anyone in the administration that that is no easy task. Every day, all of you have proved up to it. As coaches, as faculty, as administrators, as university presidents at Division I schools, you are really the best of the best.

By teaching young women and men to test the limits of their abilities and to represent their schools with pride and dignity, you bring out the best of the best. That is a rare gift, a teacher's gift, a gift to memory. When I was 9, I played in a new pigtail softball league in Cleveland. We had a coach who told us if we worked hard, if we would learn how to throw overhand and slide, we could probably win the city championship. His name was George Steinbrenner and he was right.

I have also for years admired all of your special gifts, the special gift in the coaches and the athletics staff, particularly at the University of Wisconsin and when I was in Division III at Hunter. But my years at Wisconsin only increased my enthusiasm for Division I intercollegiate sports.

I saw how to mold not just ability but character, how you turn broad desire into agility and discipline, how girls become women and boys become men from your discipline and skillful coaching.

In the President's new child-care initiative, which he announced last week, is hundreds of millions of dollars for after-school programs that we hope will include a heavy dose and commitment to athletics as a way to build confidence and skills, particularly among our young people in the inner cities.

My enthusiasm for intercollegiate athletics did not stop with their effect on young people. Athletics, I believe, can be a transforming experience for

our great universities and colleges. It is not just the team building and the raised spirit. I believe that intercollegiate athletics is like a great oak tree in the center of town. They draw a university community together, they lead us to reflect on the changing seasons and our timely values. They inspire memories and friendships that can change a life and last a lifetime.

There is no greater feeling than to be young on a Saturday afternoon and walking with a friend to a sports event on a great American college campus. As I mentioned a moment ago, a special gift belongs to those who teach, and I would like to give you an example that comes not from the world of sports but from the world of classical music.

If Charles Woodson and Nykesha Sales were violin players instead of star college athletes, they might be mistaken for Itzhak Perlman or Midori. Perlman recently sat down with a famous celebrity interviewer, Big Bird. "Who was your best music teacher?" asked Big Bird. "My first," answered Perlman, "because after only about a month of lessons my first teacher told my parents I needed a new teacher. She said she wasn't good enough."

I liked that story, not only because of what the teacher recognized in Perlman, but what she recognized in herself, which was the responsibility she had to do everything she could to nurture his rare talent. That is what many of you do all the time in your classrooms, in the laboratories, in the libraries and on the playing field.

I know that the NCAA has heard a lot of criticism in recent years, some of it from Washington. But the fact is that the NCAA at its best and for 100 years has been dedicated to protecting the integrity of college sports and the safety of our young people. That has not changed. Most Americans don't know that overall graduation rates in Division I are actually slightly higher for athletes than nonathletes. We also note the skeptics about Proposition 48 were wrong.

So, at the close of an exciting Division I college football season and the opening of another wide-open season for women's and men's basketball, all of us who love watching the best in college sports have a lot to celebrate. But like any good coach, I am not prepared to say that we can't do better.

Because the fact is, we can do better and we must. While our nation's best young athletes are running day in and day out striving for nothing but the best and hitting tape-measure home runs, our universities and our athletics programs still face major challenges both on and off the field—challenges like Itzhak Perlman's teacher faced that require us to think long term and to act in the best interest of athletes rich in talent but short on experience.

You have the challenge to honor the grace of sport by thinking not just about the players, but about those who come to watch, to enjoy and to experience the games. That will not be easy. But there are two important places to begin, and I am going to talk about them this morning.

They are not particularly popular topics, but I couldn't come here today without saying something. There is no group that I have worked with during my years in the academy that I thought were better impact players on our campuses than the presidents, the faculties, the athletics staffs and the coaches.

The first issue is about the behavior that too many young people either associate with athletic activities or simply believe, often wrongly, have a place in athletic competitions.

The second is to once and for all make sports from Division I competition to just playing out in the backyard as much a part of the life of young women

as young men. A week ago, the New York Times, in a special education supplement, ran a cover story on binge drinking.

I am personally haunted by the problems of young people and drinking. I once recruited a brilliant young man from northern Wisconsin, a young man of great promise. In the process of recruiting him, I offered him at the first game of the year a seat next to me.

The night before his high-school graduation, a drinking party ended his life. Each fall, I remembered the empty seat that he and too many of his generation leave open on our campuses. For you, and certainly for the parents of young people who have been injured or died, the problem of binge drinking is not new. It has come to our campuses with a vengeance.

In the state of Virginia alone, five college students died in one month in incidents tied to alcohol. The most recent victim, a 21-year-old woman, was thought to be participating in a ritual called "fourth-year fifth," where the senior drank a fifth of liquor at the last football home game. Her blood alcohol was .27, three times the legal limit in Virginia. There have been alcohol-related deaths at Louisiana State, Fordham, the University of Massachusetts, Vanderbilt, Penn State, and at many, many other schools.

The problem is just not acute alcohol poisoning or car accidents involving alcohol. We know that alcohol abuse can lead to later health problems including types of cancer and it is frequently a factor in assault, date rapes, suicide and drowning. In fact, most of the serious problems that I dealt with on the two university campuses I have led were related to students drinking.

Later this week, the administration will be releasing a study on the relationship between the age at which someone begins drinking alcohol and the subsequent development of the medical disorders caused by alcohol abuse and dependence.

This much we know already. The most recent data indicates that almost 90 percent of college students have used alcohol, but almost 40 percent binge drink. Forty percent! Binge drinking is more prevalent among college students than noncollege students of the same age. We know that white males are more likely to binge drink and African-American women the least likely. Research also tells us that drinking in high school is highly predictive of binge drinking in college.

Last month, we released a study that measures substance abuse among eighth, 10th and 12th graders. We noticed the numbers. The 12th graders who drank five or more drinks in a row at least once during a two-week period increased in 1997, while the numbers of seniors who thought that having five or more drinks once or twice each weekend was harmful decreased. That means that our message about the dangers of alcohol are not getting through to older teenagers—teenagers who are getting ready to pack their bags and come to your colleges and universities this fall.

I am not here to tell you that universities and their athletics departments and the NCAA are to blame for this continuing tragedy. You are not. Nor am I suggesting that athletes are more involved with alcohol than nonathletes. They are not.

But I am here to tell you that we have a problem and that you have a major role to play in the fight against alcohol abuse. We need your leadership. You can make a difference by what you do or don't do.

Just think of what happened at one California university. The basketball team entered the court by running through an inflatable beer can tunnel. The connection was made between drinking and athletics, which was absolute-

ly unmistakable. This tradition continued even after a star guard removed himself from the team so that he could get help with his drug- and alcohol-abuse problems.

Who eventually decided to take that tunnel down? Not the school, but the local beer distributor that originally paid to put it up. As you know, right now advertising restrictions only apply to the NCAA championships. We don't think that is good enough.

We need in this country to sever the tie between college sports and drinking completely, absolutely and forever. That is why we believe that the time has come for schools to consider voluntary guidelines that say no alcohol advertising on the premises of an intercollegiate athletics event, no bringing of alcohol to the site of the event, no turning of a blind eye to underage drinking and to tailgate parties on campus, and saying "no" to alcohol sponsorship of intercollegiate sporting events.

All institutions of higher learning should follow the lead of Chapel Hill, Baylor and Brigham Young by saying no to alcohol sponsorship of sporting events. I know better than anyone that this has an impact on revenue. I know there has been stiff resistance both inside and outside of the NCAA to these kinds of guidelines in the past. But the time has come to seriously reconsider them, especially in the light of the recent alcohol-related deaths and research that suggests advertising may influence adolescents to be more favorably disposed to drinking.

Breaking the connection between sports and drinking is only part of the solution to the problems of alcohol and drugs on the campus. We have recently broken the connection between professional baseball and chewing tobacco. It had an impact on young people. We saw the decline last year of six percent in the number of young people who were starting to use spit tobacco.

We need in this country to focus more on prevention, on early detection and on timely intervention. College students who receive even a single conference session will significantly reduce their drinking, and there is some evidence that challenging false expectations about drinking can reduce the use of alcohol among college students.

But individual counseling and intervention are not enough. We need a comprehensive prevention strategy on every campus in this country, and we need your help to do that. Our fight against alcohol abuse and underage drinking is actually part of a much larger substance-abuse strategy that includes our marijuana initiative, in which we are reaching out to parents and kids with "no-use" messages. But the government will never be able to prevent alcohol and drug abuse alone. It should not have to. The universities, colleges and the athletics departments, the media, business and families have to be part of this fight. Many universities are already thinking creatively about ways to end alcohol abuse.

My own University of Wisconsin, with the help of almost \$1 million grant from the Woodruff Johnson Foundation, is looking at the entire culture of drinking on campus—from the influence of sororities and fraternities to advertising. Other universities are making similar efforts focused on prevention. Vanderbilt, for example, is imposing tough sanctions on students using fake ID's and Virginia is improving staff training and offering nonalcohol entertainment.

I mentioned that binge drinking on campus frequently has its root in teenage alcohol consumption—consumption that we are now learning how to reduce or even prevent. The fact is, young people are starting drinking

earlier and earlier. Where it used to start on college campuses, we have a whole different culture today of young people arriving at our campuses as experienced drinkers.

Project Northland, a 1996 study sponsored in part by the National Institutes of Health, shows that prevention programs targeted at the young adolescents can work, but that prevention efforts and those interventions must be sustained and include active involvement of parents and teachers, coaches and peers, and local colleges and universities.

That kind of community partnership lies at the heart of the NCAA National Youth Sports Program. As our department continues actively to support NYSP, I encourage you to strengthen that program as a tool to fight drug and alcohol abuse. It is an effective way to reach kids who have big dreams or face the big danger of falling through the cracks.

Many of those young people with big dreams are young women, which is why the National Youth Sports Program has something new and important going for it—your girls sports clinic. I believe that it is a slam dunk to encourage girls to participate in sports and to use coaches and student-athletes as role models for girls.

Similarly, I think that your women's enhancement program, which is helping women who want careers in sports, is a definite winner. But I am going to be blunt about this. As a country, we have not done enough to keep girls physically active when they are young, nor to open up opportunities for scholarships and participation in intercollegiate sports when they are older. According to your own survey, there has been only a 6-percent gain in the number of female athletes in the last five years. Women are behind men in scholarships, coaching salaries, recruitment and in operating expenditures. This means we are a long way from fulfilling the letter and spirit of Title IX.

There is an enormous consensus in this country about Title IX. No sport, including football, will ever be exempted from Title IX. There is bipartisan consensus about this in Washington, and that consensus will not change no matter how many people come to Washington.

I know that your new Board has made gender equity and diversity a priority for 1998, but there can be no disagreement that 25 years after we enacted Title IX, too many girls and women are still outside looking in when it comes to participating in physical activity in sports. There have been numerous studies that conclude that female adolescents are less physically active than their male counterparts. This inactivity can have adverse emotional and physical consequences, everything from obesity and heart disease to depression and poor body image.

That is why at last year's Women's Final Four we released a report that reminded us again that female athletes do better in school and drop out less frequently than nonathletes; that girls who participate in sports have a greater sense of confidence and control, and that physical activities are a money-saver as well as a life-saver.

As I said in Cincinnati, this report is part of the President's "girl-power campaign," where we are trying to tell 9- to 14-year old girls that it doesn't matter if you walk, if you dance or play sports, to get smart, get active and stay healthy.

Who in this room hasn't seen the pattern? Girls once told of revision and promise enter the second decade of their lives without the strength that got them there. No one, I suspect. But not unlike Martin Luther King's dream

that we will celebrate a week from today, Title IX's promise is within sight but not yet within reach.

We have come a long way since my mother, a great athlete at Ohio State in the 1930s, had to clean people's home to pay her tuition. Let's make the 21st century a time when the words "sports" and "athletes" are as much about women as they are about men. We all need to vocally support women's athletics. We need to be role models, to deliver a message of sports equality to students, faculties, to alumni, the boosters and the media. Title IX is the law of the land and it is morally right, but just as important, it is right for the country.

Today, many of our nation's leaders come from the ranks of men's athletics programs. But as we train the next generation of leaders, we have to recognize that women will be everywhere—from the courtroom to the boardroom to the oval office. So all of us must work together to help them acquire the qualities that make great leaders—confidence, discipline and courage.

Last night, I had a long conversation with Sally Ride. We both concluded that when we are interviewing young women, we can almost tell if she has been involved in intercollegiate sports.

Second, parity and funding must be more than a goal, it must be a reality. That means more money for operating women's sports programs, for hiring women's coaches and trainers, and for women scholarships and recruitment. Justice often comes with a price tag. But the only way to get more women on the playing field is to level the playing field, and we need in this country to level it off and not down.

Third, we need to form more public and private partnerships defining support for promising young female athletes. They are out there for every sport but they need encouragement, training and good facilities. If we provide it, they will come.

Fourth, we won't see more women participating in intercollegiate sports if we don't tell more girls to get active and away from alcohol, from drugs and tobacco. So I hope that all of you will team up in your communities with schools, with the media, with women's organizations, with the alumni, the sports clubs and with government to help craft and spread good public health messages for girls.

Our smoke-free kids campaign with the U.S. women's national soccer team encourages girls to put down cigarettes and to pick up soccer balls. We even have a new PSA produced by Anson Dorrance, coach of the UNC (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) women's soccer team, that promotes the campaign.

Smoke-free kids could be replicated in other sports in softball, basketball, swimming and gymnastics where coaches and stars for both men's and women's teams help to get out good public health messages. So just think of me as a friendly but savvy recruiter, offering you the opportunity of a lifetime. We need volunteers. I hope that the NCAA will join me in helping to find them.

Fifth, we need to truly believe in women's athletics abilities. My mother is now in her 80s and still active athletically. She is also living proof of the health benefits of competitive sports and of staying active. But many women of her generation and even mine with talent never had the chance to show it. That must change. The time of living on the sidelines, of searching for the spotlight and having to settle for second place, must come to an end for women in this country. Today, every promising young female athlete, like the Honda

Broderick finalists, should be able to look in the mirror and think I am in the big leagues now and the big leagues belong to me as well as my brothers.

The NCAA must mean the best for women and men, because this country needs women and men who are champions on and off the playing field. So in ending, let me thank you for letting me come home to the community I love, to the community I respect, to raise the ball, to give you the challenges that will make this country as we end this century the place we want it to be for all of our young people. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Bowlsby: Thank you, Secretary Shalala, for those insightful and inspiring comments. I know that I speak for our membership when I say "thank you" for all you have done for higher education, for collegiate athletics and all you do today for our nation in all of your activities around the world. It is nice to have you here with us this morning.

It is now my pleasure to introduce to you the leader of our Division I organization, Chancellor Kenneth Shaw, from Syracuse. During the last 24 months, no one has been more tireless in their efforts on behalf of restructuring and making sure that the new structure works in a way that is responsive to the membership.

He has been an outstanding leader for our organization, has spent innumerable hours in making sure that it is done right and making sure that it is done in a way that the people in this room can take pride in, can participate in, and can work together within to make our Association just as good as it can be.

Please join me in welcoming Chancellor Kenneth Shaw. (Applause)

Mr. Shaw: Thank you very much, Bob. "Tired" is probably a good way to describe it.

Bob, incidentally, as you probably know, has done an outstanding job in providing leadership to the Management Council. I will talk a little bit about that in a moment. I want to also thank Secretary Shalala for being with us today and sharing her views.

She has been an extremely strong supporter, as you can see, of intercollegiate athletics and has a passion for what is good about athletics. I am delighted to hear your message.

I want to talk briefly, because there are things to do during this Convention. I want to start by reminding you with respect to governance, the shift that has taken place.

Often, we describe it as a shift to moving to a federated system, a decentralized system. This is true. But there is an even bigger shift as is evidenced by this meeting today. That shift is from the NCAA being primarily a legislative body that deliberates and discusses and eventually passes legislation that binds the universities and the colleges to action.

That approach, as you know, became increasingly difficult as the issues became more complex. As the NCAA grew in size and in stature, the fact that it worked well is a tribute to the people who made it work, to the component universities, to the staff, all who wanted to make it work. If we compare it to other legislative bodies, we have to give ourselves an "A." But it wasn't working for us. It had as its major problem the delay in dealing with issues and the question of who was really accountable?

Do problems get solved through legislation, through staff decisions? Just who is accountable? The restructured NCAA model, particularly in Division I, is built in a different way. It runs itself more like a university, a hospital or a corporation, with the chief executive officer—Ced Dempsey—and a

Board of Directors, and in the case of NCAA Division I, a Management Council, and committees and councils dealing with pertinent issues.

The Board delegates authority and responsibility to the Management Council and its components. In its theoretical form, at least decisions should be made more quickly after much more intense and focused deliberation. That is the idea. That was the purpose of restructuring—to modernize, to make decisions in a more efficient and accountable way, in a way that promotes accountability. Over time, we hope to make better decisions.

How is it working? I believe the system is more efficient and more accountable. From the number of letters I get, many of them opposed to the decision that is made, suggests that our constituents know who is responsible. That was an important part of the change.

Issues can be brought to the table more readily. Before the Board began its work as an official body, it took the time to list key concerns facing the division. The list includes initial- and continuing-eligibility requirements, attention to student-athlete welfare, amateurism, agent issues, membership requirements, revenue distribution, and completing the implementation of the new structure.

All of these items have been identified by the membership, by the Management Council and by your Board of Directors, and where appropriate farmed out to the appropriate bodies to process it. We have only had two meetings as a Board of Directors. At our second meeting, there were 12 proposals brought before us from the Management Council. We approved 10 of them dealing with a number of items, rejected one and tabled another one. The one we rejected was the most controversial.

That was the recommendation to us to eliminate the restriction on the amount of time an individual can spend in a restricted-earnings coaching position. Agree or disagree with that decision—and many have disagreed—it was made in a timely way.

Secondly, the quality of participation has been excellent. The Board of Directors attend the meetings that are prepared, the Management Council has organized itself in a way to make decisions, and it has worked with the conferences to select an outstanding group of people to serve on the various cabinets and committees. So with less than six months under our belt, I believe that we are achieving our efficiency and our accountability goals.

Now, let me deal briefly with the criticisms that I have heard. First, there is less participation from the members. Some have said: "Oh, for the good old days when there was one vote for each institution." Now, that might have involved some participation.

I remember sitting before the voting machine wondering what I was supposed to do next. Don't believe for a minute that there was more involvement then than there is now. There are more people involved directly in the process in a substantive way today than under the old system.

Before the change in structure, there were roughly 150 people involved directly. Today, there are more than 300. In fact, if there is a concern that we have, it is that we may be proliferating the size of our committees, which may be counter to our intent to keep the whole system streamlined.

A second criticism is that the Board doesn't listen to the people close to the firing line who know what the issues are. The example that is put before us is our refusal to accept the Management Council's decision on the restricted-earnings coaches.

I would suggest that we did listen, that we did understand the issues. We

simply disagreed. It is our job to do this when we think it is in the best interest of the membership. The system was not designed to have a rubber-stamped board of presidents and chancellors, but rather a group that is willing to accept responsibility for its decisions. As you know, the constitution provides for a way to deal with this when we make bad decisions.

A third criticism is that we are too "bottoms up" or that we are "too top down." I hear both. The truth is that both the "bottoms up" and the "top down" situation pertains. Of those 12 recommendations that I mentioned from our October meeting, one of them was clearly top down in the sense that we asked the Management Council and the recruiting subcommittee of the Academics/Eligibility/Compliance Cabinet to move along their serious study in the matter of summer camps for basketball players.

We think that is a serious problem. In fact, everyone does. So I should say that that was the "top down" example. There have been a number of "bottoms up" kinds of examples and we like it that way. The system only works when it works both ways.

Fourthly, things are going too slowly. Those who know me know that I am an impatient person, but I think things are progressing about as quickly as can be expected considering that we only have had two meetings and are already attacking some of the major issues. Also, getting input of the membership through comment periods is too important to sacrifice for expediency.

Another concern I hear is that "restructuring is not what I thought it would be." Here I hear two concerns. My colleagues in I-A thought that under this new system we could control everything. That has not happened.

As you know, in framing the new document in our new approach, we decided that I-A people would have control, but not total control. Nevertheless, in matters of substance, the numbers work well for I-A. There is a Division I-A majority on the Board of Directors and the Management Council and the cabinet, but it is a slim majority. Generally, support is needed across subdivisional lines in order to make something happen.

The other concern is the opposite, from I-AA and I-AAA, that I-A is too dominant. That is something that we knew in the beginning and all agreed when we voted for restructuring. To this point, I can say, however, that in treating substantive issues, that it doesn't seem to break down on a subdivisional basis.

Another concern is that the new system doesn't allow for enough diversity. We have tried to address that. Your Board of Directors and the Division I membership has said that the Management Council and the cabinet shall be at least 35 percent representative of each gender and 20 percent of ethnics and minorities. They are. The other bodies are intended to reflect similar diversity.

So after six months, I can tell you that we are more efficient. I believe we are more accountable. I believe that we are structured to be able to make decisions in a timely, and I hope wise fashion.

In the last analysis, being more efficient, more effective and more accountable is important. But the real test will be how we deal with the most important issues that are coming up or should come up. Dr. Shalala has mentioned a number of them.

There are many others that we have identified and how we deal with these issues will depend upon the quality and the commitment of all of us in this

room. One writer said the people get the kind of government and leadership that they deserve.

If we commit ourselves to the very best and if we work together, we can provide the best possible experiences for our students. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Bowlsby: Thank you, Chancellor Shaw, and thanks once again to Secretary Shalala for being here with us. This concludes the opening session this morning. We have an excellent day of forums in this area of the hotel. The first one of the morning forums begins at 9:45.

We hope that you will partake of the agenda all day long. There are some excellent opportunities for input into a couple of very large issues that are before the Management Council and will subsequently be coming before the Board. I encourage you to have a good day and thank you very much for being here this morning.

[The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.]

■ Division II Business Session

Monday Morning, January 12, 1998

The Division II business session was called to order at 8 a.m., with Adam W. Herbert, University of North Florida, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Herbert: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to call the Division II business session to order. My name is Adam Herbert, I chair the Division II Presidents Council and I am president of the University of North Florida. For those of you who have been coming to Conventions over the past couple of years, as you will note, I am not Lynn Dorn.

This is a very historic Convention for Division II. It is the first Convention that we have called under the new governance structure of the NCAA. All of the business sessions and forums that you will be attending other than yesterday afternoon's opening business session are geared specifically for Division II delegates.

I would like to note and apologize to those delegates who were seated in the middle of the floor. We've had a major water problem this morning and those delegates had to be moved. I have asked, however, that for the next Convention, that all of those who are moved, be seated down here in the front, so we'll take care of that next year.

I'd like at this time to introduce a few folks. First is our parliamentarian, Paul Englemann, who is professor of economics at Central Missouri State University. Also, the governance staff of Division II, which works so very hard on our behalf—Nancy Mitchell, who is our chief of staff, Mike Racy, who is the assistant chief of staff, and Shelley Etzenhouser, our executive assistant who keeps everything together for us. Thank you, Shelley. Also, we have the NCAA membership services staff headed up by Dave Schnase. Dave, thank you very much. Although we'll be hearing from her again in a few moments, let me just acknowledge the presence of Lynn Dorn, who is chair of the Management Council for Division II.

Let me now call your attention to two Convention publications. First, the Convention program. On Page 8, you will find the program for today's Division II business session. The second publication is the 1998 NCAA Convention Official Notice, which you should have received in November. In Appendix A, the blue pages of the Official Notice, Pages 35 to 36, you will find a list of the 19 legislative proposals that will be considered during this business session. We will attempt to follow the business session outline as it is listed on Page 8 of the Convention Program. We will recess no later than 12:30 today for lunch and will then conclude our business and adjourn no later than 5 p.m. today.

Please note that on Page 4 of the Convention Program there are minor corrections to some of the proposals. Please keep in mind that these are technical revisions that do not alter the original intent of the sponsors. One procedure that we must dispense with is the need to adopt the Convention Program before beginning our business.

At this time, I would like to ask for a motion to adopt the program of this

Convention so that we may actually proceed with our work. The floor is now open for such a motion.

[The motion was seconded.]

It's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor, please say "aye." Opposed? We may now proceed.

Robert's Rules of Order provides that procedures therein may be superseded or replaced by an organization's own traditional and customary practices and procedures. This Association has a number of such procedures. Several of them are reviewed in the introductory section of your Convention Official Notice. In addition, you will find in your Official Notice several appendices listing information that may be of assistance to each of you.

NCAA Convention procedures are designed to ensure fairness and also equitable treatment for all members to eliminate any questions of propriety and to expedite your work as delegates. I hoped to take time to explain all of the parliamentary procedures that will be used to ensure fairness, but I will remind the delegates that we fully intend to apply these procedures throughout the business of the Convention.

There are certain procedures we will employ in attempting to use our time wisely and efficiently. First, I will attempt to "eyeball" as many votes as possible, calling for a count only when there is doubt as to the majority. Although the delegates have a right to ask for it, I would request that all delegates refrain from calling for a vote count unless one really seems necessary to determine the disposition of an issue. Second, if a delegate intends to debate an issue in any business session, we ask you to go to one of the microphone locations and be prepared to speak when the motion has been made and seconded or as soon as the previous speaker has concluded his or her remarks. The microphone numbers will be utilized to recognize speakers. If I see no one at a microphone, the vote will then be called as quickly as possible. Finally, please keep in mind that NCAA procedures require all votes to be by paddle or electronically, not by voice or show of hands. You need to have your voting paddle and your wireless voting units with you during this session. The electronic voting procedures will be reviewed when the first electronic vote is cast.

The voting and speaking privileges for NCAA Conventions also are set forth in NCAA legislation and are summarized in the Official Notice of the Convention. I will not try to repeat them here. I would ask, however, that you identify yourself by name and affiliation whenever you address the Convention. Those delegates wearing Convention badges with ribbons are permitted to speak. Those without ribbons are visitors and may not take part other than as observers.

Let me also briefly review the window of reconsideration opportunity. This afternoon, immediately after lunch, I will call for a motion to reconsider any legislation adopted during this morning's session. This will be your last opportunity to consider legislation during this Convention. As you will notice, in front of the dais, we have a court reporter who is preparing a transcript of this business session. So, I would ask that you identify yourself and your institution or affiliation whenever you speak.

We now will begin our voting on the 19 Division II proposals that are noted with asterisks on Page 35. We're going to start the process that will ultimately lead to that. Proposals 1 through 7 are part of the Presidents Council grouping and have been identified as key legislative issues that are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers. These have been des-

ignated by the Division II Presidents Council for roll-call votes and must be considered first. We will then act on the remaining Division II proposals beginning with Proposal No. 8.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

At this time, I would like to provide you with a brief summary of the Division II Presidents Council's actions over the past year, and that will be followed by a report from Lynn Dorn.

First, on behalf of the presidents, I want to tell you that all of us have been very impressed with the manner in which we have gone through the transition process. The level of participation at the Presidents Council level, the Management Council level, and all of our committees and working groups has been outstanding. I'm particularly proud of the level of involvement of our chief executive officers on the Division II Presidents Council.

The presidents have been at every meeting—we've had at least four a year—and we've had a number of telephone conference calls. The individuals who serve as your representatives on the Presidents Council clearly come prepared to discuss issues that are critical to the Division II membership and the Association as a whole. We have attempted to be as responsive as possible to all of our institutions. As we have heard about problems, we have immediately asked the Management Council to take a look at those and attempt to address them. One of our hopes is that as many CEOs as possible in the audience today will express an interest over the course of the next few years in taking part on the Division II Presidents Council as we have vacancies.

I also want to highlight that the relationship between the Presidents Council and the Management Council has been outstanding. We began this Convention with a meeting between the two bodies to talk about the coming year, issues and priorities so that we could make 1998 a banner year.

I must tell you that there have been issues on which we have agreed. There have been issues on which we've differed. But what has been so impressive is that we have been able to talk through those issues. The Management Council has helped us to better understand some of the concerns that they have had. We, as presidents, have shared some of our interests and concerns and have been able to resolve those in a fashion that I think we all can be very proud of.

The initial composition of the Division II committee structure includes an impressive collection of Division II administrators with a variety of athletics experiences and backgrounds. I think that we must continue to strive for strong female and ethnic minority representation within our governance structure. This has been identified as a major priority for the presidents. We hope that the Management Council and the Presidents Council working together will assure that this priority is addressed.

This year, we have implemented a series of enhanced programs that are geared toward improving compliance at our Division II institutions and conferences. As soon as the membership moratorium is lifted—and we have submitted a proposal to the Executive Committee to do just that—the NCAA again begins accepting applications for membership.

Each new member of the NCAA in Division II will undergo a four-year educational program that we hope will ensure that these institutions understand what it means to be a member of the NCAA and what it means to be a member of Division II. They will then come into the NCAA more fully prepared for both of the demands and benefits of NCAA membership.

Let me comment briefly on championships. Championships access is a critical issue for Division II. All of us understand that. I want to assure you that the Presidents Council is keenly aware of this. With that in mind, upon the recommendation of the Division II Championships Committee and the Management Council, we did last year approve bracket expansion for championships in four sports: baseball, softball, volleyball and men's and women's soccer. We also issued a directive to the Division II Championships Committee to study the current policies and procedures related to championships access and site selection. We asked that they come back with a report and set of recommendations for our consideration.

We realize that this is not an issue that is easily solved, nor is it an area where we can please everyone. But we believe that the implementation of the new governance structure gives us an opportunity to fully explore alternatives in these areas and that this does demand action as soon as possible.

I also would like to briefly mention one area that will receive continued study and attention by the presidents over the coming months—the Division II budget. As many of you know, with the new governance structure, Division II is now guaranteed 4.37 percent of the Association's general operating revenue on an annual basis. This money is to be used for Division II-specific programs such as championships. You will hear today from Tony Ceddia, vice-chair of the Presidents Council and chair of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee. He will talk about two major issues that must be resolved. First, the distribution of the Division II enhancement fund and use of the unallocated fund in Division II.

These are examples of some of the key issues on which the Presidents Council will focus during our spring and fall meetings. All of the presidents are here today, and we look forward to hearing your comments and feedback during the discussion session this afternoon.

At this time, I would like to ask Lynn Dorn, who is director of women's athletics at North Dakota State University and chair of the Management Council, to give you a report on the work of the Division II Management Council.

As she's coming up to the podium, I just want to tell you that Lynn Dorn has done an outstanding job over the past year. Come up, Lynn, I want to say this while you are next to me. She has exercised outstanding leadership of the Management Council. She has done a tremendous job of explaining to the presidents the views of the Management Council. She's helped to educate us on very delicate issues on some occasions. I think all of us on the Presidents Council have deeply appreciated the wonderful job that she's done.

To give you a sense of the time that is involved here, she attends every meeting of the Management Council. She attends every meeting of the Presidents Council. She attends all the meetings of the Executive Committee of the Association. We have a number of Administrative Committee conference calls for Division II and we also end up talking on the phone on a regular basis as issues are presented to me on behalf of the membership.

She's always prepared to give up her time and energy. She's a problem solver and has done an outstanding job. On behalf of all of us, Lynn, I just want to thank you for your leadership and your outstanding service to the NCAA and to Division II.

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT

Lynn Dorn (North Dakota State University): Thank you, Adam, very

much for those kind remarks. Perhaps this is a bit out of order. I would usually save this for an adjournment. I'm sure most of you have heard the good news for President Herbert. He has just accepted the position of chancellor of the Florida state university system. Obviously, it's a position that warrants a lot of skills and it's a very prestigious position. But with the acceptance of that position, President Herbert will no longer serve as chair for the our Division II Presidents Council or chair of the Division II Administrative Committee.

Adam, on behalf of Division II, and on my personal behalf, we wish you the very best. It's been a positive working relationship. Many of you know that Adam was an original architect during the period of transition. If you've ever had an opportunity to observe his negotiating skills, to watch him manage and to just have such fluid dynamic interaction, in particular with our colleagues at Division I, I think you'll agree with me that your success, Adam, in your new position will be very tremendous. Would you please extend a warm note of congratulations and one of appreciation on behalf of the membership? [The delegates gave an extended ovation.]

Thank you.

As Adam did indicate to you, I wanted to share some of the observations that have occurred on behalf of the Management Council.

As most of you know, the Association's new governance structure was officially implemented in August, just five months ago. We began laying the groundwork before that, but I think it would be important for us to share with you some of the highlights that with your cooperation and input we have achieved. We are very appreciative of your support and really want to acknowledge that we really believe in the inclusion and the participation of each and every one of you. We said that that was one of our themes throughout—that we wanted participation and inclusion. By your response and by your input, we really feel that this is one of the major goals that we've been able to accomplish.

On a more formal note, in the spring of 1996, you received a series of Division II membership surveys. It gave us guidance, as Adam said, under governance, championships, financial aid, membership, budget and finance. These memberships surveys were imperative. They began to lay for us a course of direction. The response was outstanding. In the fall of 1996, as Adam again indicated, the Division II compliance initiatives were approved. We felt it very important that although athletics certification did not pass in Dallas in 1996, that we nevertheless heard that as an Association and the Division II membership, that we still wanted a very strong and mature compliance program.

As a result, we have an enhanced ISSG and a new four-year provisional membership educational program, both of which we think are very excellent tools.

Again in the fall of 1996, and on behalf of all of our student-athletes, the presidents saw fit to expand the championship bracket opportunities for our men and women athletes. Baseball, softball, volleyball and men and women soccer student-athletes are going to enjoy enhanced experiences, again doing the right thing for the right people.

In the spring of 1996, we saw Division II vacancies filled by 44 new individuals within Division II, an outgrowth of the restructured Association and more opportunities. We really encourage you to become a part of the committee structure. It is so exciting and so challenging and so wonderful to be

associated with the NCAA. As you move through the governance structure, we began with participation opportunities at the committee level. The diversity of our membership is so important on committees. We really feel that the creation of 44 new opportunities within Division II is really going to produce a positive, positive outcome of a restructured Association.

A highlight for many of us on the Management Council and certainly on the Presidents Council, was the first-ever NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee summit that was held in Denver this past summer. It was an incredible experience for those of us who had an opportunity to watch the best and the brightest of our student-athletes come together and actually have a voice—a voice that we wanted so very, very much to hear from.

These young men and women who represent our institutions are second to none. They are proud people with goals. They are proud people with direction. Of all the events that I think we've had throughout the past 18 months, that association with our young men and women in Division II was really I think a very, very important highlight.

Another unique and I think different opportunity in Division II was that all chairs of all sport committees came together this fall to talk about your No. 1 priority—championship structure and championship opportunity. All the chairs gathered with the leadership of Dennis Poppe and Clint Bryant, who chaired the Division II Championships Committee and talked about the uniqueness of Division II championships. He also talked about concerns, about issues and about direction. An outgrowth of that was an overview manual that each of you received this past fall and will have an opportunity to discuss later this morning.

The other one I think is very important—certainly Adam alluded to it—is the pride that we have with our working relationship with the Presidents Council. We really have throughout the restructured Association talked about being a model, a model for Division I and for Division III. We really believe that we've accomplished that because first and foremost, we have such an outstanding collegial working relationship with our presidents.

As Adam said, we have learned very much. Their guidance and their assistance have been very positive. On the other side, I think they've been very open and they have welcomed our dialogue and our input. I'm always very proud to say that Division II, for the right reasons, once again has a very strong working relationship with their presidents.

Issues and priorities nevertheless also are there for us in the upcoming months. I would like to share some of our priorities that we feel need our attention.

Certainly, there's deregulation and rule simplification. It's really been a personal priority for Adam, one he hopes we give continued prioritization.

We need to review and make recommendations regarding how to distribute Division II enhancement money. We've formed a team that we'll talk about shortly. We also need to review alternatives for the use of the projected Division II reserve fund and implement the new four-year provisional membership educational program. As Adam indicated, if the moratorium indeed is lifted tomorrow morning by the Executive Committee, it will permit new provisional memberships to be contemplated within Division II.

We need to continue to enhance ethnic minority representation at all levels of the Division II governance structure and enhance the role of the senior women administrator and the athletics representatives at both the institutional and conference level.

Those of us who had the opportunity to go to the administrators forum yesterday heard from two of our leaders talking about the significance of the role of the senior woman administrator. She is an individual who fills one of our valued roles. We also rely on the faculty athletics representative, an individual who we have prioritized in our governance structure and really believe has an important say in the governance process.

We need a thorough review of the Division II membership requirements for all active members by our Division II membership committee. Again, what do we want for minimum criteria to have membership within Division II? What might we want to look like? Who do we want to be? It's our opportunity to create our own portrait.

Next, we also need to further define the involvement for student-athletes in the Division II structure. As we continue visiting with them and listening, we only see brighter and more positive relationships with our student-athletes. Finally, a very important piece, is the thorough review of our initial-eligibility clearinghouse process and academic standards within Division II.

Those are the priorities. Those are our issues. There certainly are many more that lie ahead of us, but we feel good about our direction. On behalf of the Management Council, we thank you very, very much.

On a personal note, I would like to thank all 23 other members of the Management Council. As Adam alluded, there is a lot of work that goes into it, but I'm sure that each and every one of your conference representatives would stand before you with a lot of pride in representing you. So, Adam, best of luck and thank you for this opportunity on behalf of the Management Council.

Mr. Herbert: Before considering the legislation, our first order of business is to ratify the individuals selected to fill positions on the Division II Management Council. The NCAA constitution requires all Management Council selections to be ratified by the Division II membership at the subsequent NCAA Convention.

This ratification is not a call for additional nominations. It is a formal acceptance of the members of the Management Council, as approved by the Presidents Council. A chart detailing the composition of this group has been distributed. At this time, the chair would entertain a motion for ratification of the Division II Management Council members. Is there such a motion?

[A motion to ratify Division II Management Council members was made, seconded and approved.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Mr. Herbert: We are now ready to begin voting on legislative proposals. We will start with Proposal No. 1.

Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committees

Marvalene Hughes (California State University, Stanislaus): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 1.

[The motion was seconded.]

Let me remind everyone that students are the pulse and the heartbeat of the Association. We exist because of student-athletes. Our concern for their welfare as well as our interest in providing educational opportunities should guide our decision today.

In July, I too had the pleasure to attend the inaugural Management Council meeting and the student summit. It was a very exhilarating experience.

During the summit, the student-athletes and the Management Council agreed that student-athlete representation must be enhanced at the grass-root level in order to provide student-athletes with a grass-root opportunity for leadership in the governance structure.

The establishment of a student-athlete advisory committee on Division II campuses has allowed student-athletes to become more involved in the issues surrounding intercollegiate athletics in their community.

The Division II Management Council recommended and the Division II Presidents Council agreed that it is time to require each Division II conference to develop a student-athlete advisory committee for its member institutions. Such a committee will establish a network for student-athletes to share issues and concerns regarding conference issues. This procedure will further empower our student-athletes and enable them to add value to Division II. For all these reasons and more, I urge your unanimous support of this proposal.

Peggy L. Green (Fayetteville State University): The Management Council urges your support of this proposal. The Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, like the Management Council, is a 24-person group that is based on conference representation. It therefore is crucial that this legislation be adopted to require conferences to establish student-athlete advisory committees in order for the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to function as it was designed.

All Division II student-athletes deserve a voice on NCAA issues. This can only be accomplished if conferences have a system in place that will allow the conference's representative to the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee to communicate with other student-athletes in the conference before he or she attends national meetings.

Remember, this proposal is permissive in the sense that it gives conferences the freedom and flexibility to establish the responsibilities and compositional requirements for the committee so that it addresses the specific needs of the conference members. For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal. Thank you.

Greg Clark (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Kennesaw State University): I represent the national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee from Kennesaw State University. The national Student-Athlete Advisory Committee strongly supports Proposal No. 1. The goal of the national SAAC is to represent the voice of student-athletes on all current issues.

In order to accomplish this, it is imperative that we have open lines of communication with the campuses. It is clear that the conference SAAC will give us an effective means to this end.

Proposal No. 1 is an essential link in enabling the student-athlete's voice to be heard at the national level. Thank you.

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): I wholeheartedly support this proposal and ask that all conference commissioners and presidents consider the use of conference enhancement funds to subsidize this program so that each of the committees in each conference can function and prosper as designed. I call for the question.

[Proposal No. 1 (Page A-2) was adopted, 215-1-1.]

Gambling Activities

Charles D. Dunn (Henderson State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 2.

[The motion was seconded.]

Bylaw 10.3 already restricts staff members of athletics departments and student-athletes in all three divisions from engaging in certain gambling activities.

This proposal broadens the scope of those restrictions to include staff members in conference offices. This legislative change is being considered by all three divisions. It has the full support of your Presidents Council. I strongly urge your support of this proposal.

Carol M. Dunn (California State University, Los Angeles): The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee has become increasingly aware of the many ways in which student-athletes can become involved in impermissible sports wagering activities and is concerned about the growing presence of gambling on our college campuses.

This presence has the potential to endanger the well being of our student-athletes as well as threaten the integrity of intercollegiate contests. The purpose of this proposal is to include conference staff members within the scope of the Association's sports wagering legislation. It is a modest step toward strengthening the application of this important rule.

The Student-Athlete Reinstatement Committee supports this proposal. I also urge your support.

Barry Blizzard (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Point of clarification. Would this proposal apply to game officials who are assigned by a conference?

David L. Schnase (NCAA Staff): Barry, I think this applies only to the staff members of the conference office.

[Proposal No. 2 (Page A-3) was adopted, 207-1-2.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grants—Division II

Fred Jacoby (Lone Star Conference): The Lone Star Conference, as a cosponsor, would like to withdraw Proposal No. 3. The conference believes there is a need for interpretations on the wording for the packaging of financial aid before voting on this issue.

Mr. Herbert: Your conference is withdrawing sponsorship. Is there another conference that is still sponsoring it?

Mr. Jacoby: That is correct.

Mr. Herbert: Is there a motion related to Proposal No. 3?

We are now on Proposal No. 4.

Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits— Institutions That Sponsor Cross Country But Do Not Sponsor Track

Jessica S. Kozloff (Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 4.
[The motion was seconded.]

Based on the recommendations from the Division II Management Council and the Division II financial aid project team, which surveyed the membership regarding equivalency limits last year, the Presidents Council agreed that an opportunity exists for Division II institutions to gain an unfair competitive advantage in the sport of cross country under current equivalency limitations that govern the sport of cross country and track and field.

This proposal will eliminate any such competitive imbalance that may exist. I urge your support of this proposal.

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): As a member of both the Division II Management Council and the Division II project team that studied financial aid issues, I urge your support of this proposal.

Permitting an institution that sponsors only cross country to provide 12.6 scholarships while requiring institutions that sponsor both cross country and track to also award up to 12.6 scholarships certainly appears inappropriate.

The Council was faced with two options: reduce the scholarship limits for institutions that sponsor only cross country; or increase the scholarship limit for institutions sponsoring both cross country and track.

We believe Proposal No. 4, which limits scholarships for "cross-country only" institutions, is the most equitable and reasonable solution. As a sidebar note, passing this legislation would make the cross-country-only scholarship limitations in Division II equal to that of Division I.

The Management Council urges your support of Proposal No. 4.

Carl McAloose (Great Lakes Valley Conference): I have a question and concern over this. What would prevent an institution that sponsors cross country to also say it sponsors track and field and then meets minimum criteria in four men's and four women's sports, but does not meet minimum criterias for track and field and offers 12.6 scholarships for track and field?

Mr. Schnase: Carl, this proposal requires an institution to sponsor indoor or outdoor track. If it is not actually sponsoring that sport, that becomes a factual issue. If the membership believes that an institution is not actually sponsoring a sport, the institution would have to defend itself. You have another protection in the constitution that says an institution's CEO must sign off if it is sponsoring the sport at the varsity level.

Mr. McAloose: What happens, though, if they do not meet the minimum criteria. Every intention is that they will, but they do not.

Mr. Schnase: It doesn't matter that they don't meet the minimum sports sponsorship criteria. That is a different issue than the sponsorship of that sport at the varsity level.

Mr. McAloose: Thank you.

Mr. Herbert: Does that answer your question?

Mr. McAloose: I'd like a little more detail. I still see a problem with this. It probably won't be, but some institutions may take advantage of it, I'm afraid.

Mr. Schnase: That's the issue I was talking about. That becomes a factual issue. The institution has to defend itself that it really is sponsoring this sport.

Mr. McAloose: So it will be based on an individual basis then?

Mr. Schnase: It's an enforcement issue.

Mr. McAloose: Thank you.

Dave Waples (Kennesaw State University): The situation just brought up is a real situation in regard to this legislation. We have cross country and we sponsor track. We sponsor track so that our cross country runners can qualify for the national championships. We meet the minimum number of events, but we never meet the minimum number of participants.

Our women and men cross country runners run in five, or six or seven track meets in the spring. But we never get close to having 14—the number required to meet the minimum number of participants.

I wrote the NCAA that this is not fair. Kennesaw State is going to automatically cut its scholarships down to five for men and six for women, but that does not preclude someone else of not doing that. So unless we get some kind of an amendment to this, you simply have done nothing as far as trying to curtail cross country teams from having more than five or six scholarships.

The rule reads that if your president says you have a track team, you have a track team and we do have a track team. We just don't have a full track team. We are not trying to pull the wool over anyone's eyes. We are simply trying to qualify our runners for the national track meet. But we do not have track and field per se across the board. We need an amendment to this or decide that unless you met both the minimum participants and the minimum number of meets in the spring of one year, you cannot have more than five or six scholarships the next year. This gentleman is exactly right, this legislation has done nothing.

Ms. Cerra: Dave, walk me through this. Institution A indicates that it is going to sponsor both track and field and cross country. Then it does not meet the minimum requirements for participation and number of contests. It is awarding more than five scholarships and ends up with really only meeting the requirements for cross country. That would be in violation of NCAA rules. Is that correct?

Mr. Waples: No, it would not be in violation of NCAA rules.

Ms. Cerra: I asked Dave to answer the question.

Mr. Waples: I'm Dave also.

Ms. Cerra: Oh, all right.

Mr. Waples: I would be happy to clarify it for you. No, they are not.

Ms. Cerra: Let's get the official interpretation.

Mr. Schnase: That is a correct clarification. They would not be in violation.

Ms. Cerra: So they would be able to award more than five scholarships. Is that correct?

Mr. Schnase: That's correct.

Ms. Cerra: So, in essence, that's creating a problem in terms of the "cross-country only" institutions. We don't have a level playing field because people can give more scholarships and then really end up with "cross-country only" for all intents and purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. Schnase: That then goes to the merits of the proposal.

Ms. Cerra: Correct, that's the purpose of the proposal. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 4 (Page A-4) was adopted, 166-42-5.]

Financial Aid—Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits—Football

Thomas R. Wistrick (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): On behalf of the 15 sponsors, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 6.
[The motion was seconded.]

Gladys Styles Johnston (University of Nebraska at Kearney): The Presidents Council believes it is important to note that it has not taken a formal position on this proposal. After discussing the proposal in detail and considering the various viewpoints of the Presidents Council representatives, this group agreed that this is an issue that should be debated and decided by the Division II membership without any influence from the Presidents Council.

Mr. Wistrick: Ladies and gentlemen, you can read the rationale statement. The facts are in there. The landscape of Division II football has changed and it will continue to change.

The survey by the financial aid project team showed that 60 percent of all football teams in Division II are below 30 equivalencies. The average Division II football equivalency is 24.1.

Division II is a great body. We are a solidified unit in most decisions, moving in the same direction. The thing I like about this group is that we're will-

ing to give up a little bit of each of our own for the good of the group. That's different than some of the other divisions that I see at the Convention.

In the past, football scholarships have come down from 45 to 40 to 36. Now it's time for another move to 30. This is the right time for this legislation. It's good that we remain a cohesive unit and that Division II football is competitive across the entire division. This is cost containment for some schools, but not for all. But gender equity and Title IX are issues for football-playing institutions. Let's make a divisional stand toward these issues.

This legislation does not hurt the student-athlete. For those who were here in 1992 and for those who were associated with football programs when the legislation moved Division II football from 40 to 36, the argument then was made that this hurts student-athletes. Our student-athletes are not in worse shape. In fact, Division II football has gotten better and strong. It will do the same after this.

The arguments against this proposal never change. It's the same as it was when it went from 45 to 40 and from 40 to 36. I assume when people come to the microphone now, the arguments will be exactly the same. But the Division II membership in the past—the football-playing institutions—stuck together. We didn't want the gap between the haves and the have-nots to get any wider. I urge you to vote in favor of this proposal for the good of Division II football across the entire division. Thank you.

Robert L. Potts (University of North Alabama): I'm speaking on behalf of 13 of our 16 presidents in the Gulf South Conference.

We strongly oppose this proposal. We think that the rationale is faulty and that the logical extension that has just been made would result with us being exactly like Division III—no scholarships.

There is no reason to believe that funds saved here would necessarily go to women's sports. I think generally it's frowned upon to limit men's sports in order to come into compliance with Title IX.

I think this would hurt diversity in our student body. We think that a reduction here would automatically mean reductions in other sports. We think that if we're going to do this, we ought to look at all sports at the same time. We think this will hurt the middle-class athlete who does not qualify for Pell or other forms of need-based assistance. This will hurt that athlete significantly.

We believe that it would increase the pressure on a number of us who want to stay in Division II to move to Division I. We don't think that is a wise thing for a number of us to do, but many of us will if there is a further reduction in scholarships in football.

Our information is that the survey upon which this proposal is based was statistically faulty in that it contained a number of institutions in the Northeast that don't offer any football scholarships. We think it would adversely impact enrollment in a number of our schools. If there is a proposal in the future that passes, such as Proposal No. 3, which was withdrawn, we think that that would necessarily have to be calculated. It would reduce some of the equivalencies, and that would also have an adverse impact.

So for those reasons, we strongly recommend a vote against this proposal.

Wallace Jackson (Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Dr. Potts of North Alabama and the Gulf South has very eloquently articulated the concern and position of the SIAC. We further believe that the rationale is very flawed for those institutions that are not in compliance or close to compliance with Title IX. We believe that their efforts should be more focused on that rather than on a reduction of football.

Consequently, we also believe this type of legislation will force the membership either to look at Division III or I-AA. We urge all the delegates to vociferously oppose this legislation. Thank you.

George A. Klebez (West Virginia Wesleyan College): West Virginia Wesleyan and the West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference will speak in favor of this proposal. We feel that the passage of this proposal will improve the competitive climate within Division II football. I urge the members to support this proposal.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I can see the reasons for and against this, but I'd like to state my reasons for my preference to keep us at the present level.

I'd rather not move closer to Division III. I really like a clarity, a clear difference between the divisions. Division II football should be recognizably better than Division III. That's why we are members of Division II. We wanted the quality. Many of us felt that we needed the scholarship program to attract players.

I do believe that our Division II institutions, or many of them if we continue to reduce the scholarships, are going to find fewer participants in football. There are many institutions that would like to keep the enrollment of football players higher. I just think we are neglecting a group of players.

At our institution, for instance, we have about five percent African-Americans. That's not as high as we would like it, but our football program is able to recruit 28 percent of our players from minorities. So for us as an institution, that is an important part of our minority recruitment program. The more dollars we can have in that, the better recruitment we can do. That's our preference anyway.

I was interested to note that at the football coaches association meeting, the Division II football coaches voted unanimously to oppose this. Now I suppose that's not surprising, but they do come from institutions that are sponsoring the legislation.

I doubt if you could get football coaches in Division III to be unanimous on anything, or in Division I for that matter either. There is some feeling that we are at a pretty sensible level for our division and we should hold to it. I hope we will.

James H. Jordan (Delta State University): Our university is in opposition to this.

You could play with 10, you could play with 15. We've cut this thing, as mentioned before, to 36. But why pick on football if we're cutting it to get gender equity to meet Title IX? Why not pick on track with 12.6? Why don't we take one from basketball, which has 10, one from swimming, which has eight, or one from hockey, which has 13? Why pick on just football?

Another thing, people who weren't at 36 are not cutting out anything; therefore, there is no money there to help their gender equity. But 36 is not a lot of scholarships. When you split them, you get about the 60 to 70 young men out on the field that it takes to run a football program.

If you cut it back, yes, everybody will be equal and it will be fair. But it does affect the quality. It does affect the number of male students you bring to campus. Our campus is 62 percent women. We're trying to get in proportion of getting enough men on campus. Now, we cut this. That's going to cut our chances to probably get a few extra men. So we're in opposition to this. Thank you.

Kay Schallenkamp (Emporia State University): I rise to speak in opposition to Proposal 6 for the following reasons:

First, football scholarships have been reduced significantly in the last few years. Adoption of this proposal would represent a 33-percent loss in six years. In light of these recent reductions, the question must be asked: "How much is enough?" Are we redefining Division II in the image of something closer to Division III?

Passage of this legislation may not reduce football squad sizes; therefore, not benefit Title IX from a participation standpoint.

This proposal will deny athletics aid opportunities for males, which is not the intent or purpose of Title IX. Finally, I agree with my colleagues from North Alabama that the cause and effect relationship proposed in this reduction would not necessarily benefit Title IX. Emporia State University along with six other MIEE institutions oppose this legislation.

Peter Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): I'm at the microphone opposing this proposition. I had all these eloquent arguments, but my colleagues have done such a tremendous job. The only thing I would like to add to it is that one of the speakers talked about the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots."

Our institution has been in the NCAA since 1988. We knew when we came into the NCAA what the limits were, what the competitive situation was. That's why we joined Division II and didn't join Division III or stay where we were at that point in time. We've worked very, very hard to raise our scholarship limits in all of our sports so that we can be competitive at the NCAA Division II level. We liked NCAA Division II. That's why we got into it. I hate to see it change, and it has been changed, especially in football over the last few years by reducing scholarships. Thank you.

Bradley Roy Smith (Chadron State College): I speak in favor of Proposal 6 and have an unusual opportunity to speak as a person who wears two hats.

I'm the athletics director as well as the head football coach. I did not vote in favor of or against Proposal No. 6. I didn't have the opportunity to attend the conference down in Dallas, but one of the things that has been talked about is the battle between the "haves" and the "have-nots." I don't think that this is the case.

In my opinion, if this proposal is passed, it will not decrease the opportunities for young men to play, but increase it from the standpoint that when we say "play," we mean play—participate, step on the field, not stand on the sidelines.

We are, of course, right now under the 36 limit. But by passing this proposal, it will give our institutions and other institutions of our type a better ability to recruit the young men who want to play college football. I speak in favor of Proposal 6.

Doug Echols (South Atlantic Conference): I believe it's inappropriate to single out the sport of football for equivalency reductions. The supporters of this legislation have indicated that this will assist in Title IX with the transfer of financial aid. But there is no guarantee in the legislation this would occur.

Additionally, if we are going to look at financial aid in regard to Title IX, we must consider proportionality of aid to the average number of student-athletes on particular teams and for all teams, not for just the sport of football.

Many of my colleagues who are considering supporting this proposal have indicated their desire for a "leveling" of the competitiveness in football for

the NCAA championships. I submit to you that the primary opportunity and proper place for this "leveling" to occur is at the conference level where regular-season competition occurs and where quality teams are established for recognition in NCAA championships.

The championship opportunities in football are for the best teams that have proven themselves in their conference and region. To use national legislation to reduce aid for the aforementioned rationale does not seem appropriate in regard to the total number of teams impacted and in regard to the number of teams involved in the championship.

Additionally, the numbers used in the survey and listed as part of the rationale in the proposed legislation showed an average award that included some schools that gave very limited or no financial aid for the sport of football. We should not focus strictly on this sport in these aid considerations. A vote to lower the opportunity for those schools and conferences that choose to issue more aid than the average is simply inappropriate.

I urge your defeat of Proposal No. 6.

Sandra Jerstad (Augustana College, South Dakota): I'm speaking in opposition to No. 6.

I come from a small liberal arts college where money for athletics is always scarce and our football team isn't necessarily at the top of our league. However, we feel strongly that we need to maintain the present scholarship level for football. We feel that reducing scholarships would adversely affect and diminish all of our athletics programs, including our women's athletics program, instead of promoting or adding to them. We feel it is a move toward mediocrity and would be a mistake for Division II.

Jerry Vandergriff (Angelo State University): We're one of the 60 percent that do not have 36. We have 30, but we are very much opposed to this proposition for all the reasons mentioned by the faculty reps association in that it does not meet Title IX, it was not the original purpose for this.

Thomas R. Wistrill (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): I'd just like to make a couple comments about some of the things that have been said. Earlier, you heard me mention that the arguments that you would hear against this proposal would be similar to the ones in 1992. The arguments did follow exactly that way.

I heard some people mention that we can't make this pitch toward non-scholarship. Going from 36 to 30 does not make us nonscholarship. It would still allow anyone to give 30 equivalencies in football.

In 1992, the football coaches in Division II voted unanimously against that proposal and it passed in this Division II body.

I've heard a couple of different arguments on both sides from people who oppose this. I've heard two or three speakers come to the microphone and say if we're going to make reductions, don't make reductions just in football, reduce it across the board. I hear other people saying we're just getting closer to Division III. If we drop across the board, does that still take us closer to Division III? But if we just drop football, it must not. I'm hearing a couple of different sides from the people who are in opposition to this. I just want to point those out.

Ed B. Harris (West Texas A&M University): Tom, the last time you brought this proposal to the floor, I don't believe you brought it couched in terms of gender equity. I think that was a move to cloud the issue a bit. The last time we were just dealing with the competitive issues.

I don't believe there will be more money to spend for gender equity if we are not already spending that. Angelo State was at this microphone before me. They compete in the Lone Star Conference with 30. Angelo State lost one game in our conference this year with 30 and defeated a I-AA opponent this year. So we have many people in Division II right now who can be competitive with less than 36. The idea of lowering the bar and lowering the bar, we've done that over and over again. What we really end up doing is punishing young men.

I looked on our own campus. Of the top four sports—men's basketball, women's basketball, women's volleyball and football—we spend less on average on a football athlete right now than we do on others. Those other sports on our campus have 28 full scholarships that produce approximately 36 athletes. Football has 36 scholarships producing around 100 athletes for our institution. If we lower this to 30, we'll still have 100 football players, but those young men will have much less to go to school on. I think this is a student issue.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): The previous speaker touched on something that I would like to further elaborate upon.

It's a very serious concern in our conference and perhaps around the country when you look at it. We have a process in which we require eligibility lists to be filed in each sport. That list is mandatory. You must list every single student-athlete who is going to participate in your sport.

I heard someone mention that this will not affect Division II football. I'm here to tell you that at our schools, it has and it will. Our typical institutions have lost between 18 and 34 football players since the last cuts in scholarship numbers. Think about what those dollars really mean. We took away nine scholarships and an institution loses a net of 34 football players. If each of them were receiving one-fourth of a scholarship, it means a three-quarter equivalency came from someplace else and is no longer in the coffers of that institution. That may not be the case at every one of your schools. It is fact in ours. I have not heard any other statement or evidence about what the effect of these cuts actually is on enrollment numbers.

I have another concern. I don't know how many folks will say this, but I will. I did not get to attend the institution of my choice when I came out of high school. My family could not afford it. Every time we take money away, particularly in athletics, it disappears. It doesn't come back. It doesn't get shifted to another sport in many instances. How many more student-athletes or students in general who come from middle-class families with two or three siblings on the way behind them might lose an opportunity, might have to go to a junior college or settle for something less than they might have had, if this legislation passes? At some point, we have to stand up and say enough is enough, please stop the cuts.

I also find it interesting that we haven't heard from anyone from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee on this issue, which seems to have a huge impact on dollars that help them attend institutions.

I also would point out respectfully that the argument that this will not affect the quality of Division II football simply doesn't seem to make sense. I don't have all the numbers handy, but I think that if you look at the number of players leaving our level and going up to the NFL, getting pro opportunities, it would increase.

As far as spending less to attract the same number of athletes, dollars and

cents don't add up there. If you spend less, you will attract fewer and you will attract a lower quality. It's just logic. Thank you.

David W. Coffey (Northwood University): Northwood, like Augustana, is a small, private enrollment university competing in Division II. Approximately 25 percent of our overall enrollment is student-athletes. This year, for example, we have 118 student-athletes involved in our football program. Our football players average less than 30 percent full-ride scholarship.

To further reduce football grants-in-aid would have a very negative impact on our squad size and therefore our institution's overall enrollment. It would seem that as Division II continues to grow in numbers in the years ahead, that much of the projected growth could very well be in private institutions. Why should we want to pass legislation at this time knowing that that would have a negative impact on our projected new members?

If we want to accomplish both a cost savings and avoid an enrollment decline, perhaps at next year's Convention we should consider a tuition-and-fee-only plus need-based-aid proposition. Thank you.

Stormie Wells (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/University of Northern Colorado): The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee officially took no position, but I would like to share some of our thoughts in terms of why we did so. We are in favor of competitive parity for all student-athletes. However, we felt that the rationale was flawed in its implication that gender equity would be affected.

This legislation would not affect the ability of the majority of institutions to reallocate funds since they do not currently offer the maximum amount of equivalencies. Even if this was a gender-equity issue, as has been stated, there is no legislation to mandate the reallocation of funds to a particular area such as women's sports.

In addition to this belief, we as a committee do not feel that cutting men's sports is the only way—it's certainly not the best way—to affect Title IX. That has always been the belief of our committee and will continue to be its belief.

That being said, we also feel it is unfair to single out one sport—that being football. Reevaluating how dollars are spent should be done at the conference and institutional level. So those are some of those thoughts, even though we took no position.

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): I would like to call the question.

Mr. Herbert: I will take that as a motion so that we don't have to have a two-thirds vote. The chair sees no other speaker so we're ready to vote. Let me call to your attention that only those institutions that sponsor football should cast votes for Proposal No. 6.

[Proposal No. 6 (Page A-5) was defeated, 61-75-6.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Spring Practice—Division II Football

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 7.

Based on the recommendation from the Division II Management Council and the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor this legislation in an effort to reduce the serious injuries that are occurring in Division II spring football.

I urge our colleagues to support this proposal. Thank you.

Chuck Neinas (American Football Coaches Association): This legislation has been adopted for both Divisions I-A and I-AA football. It was carefully crafted, involving the Collegiate Commissioners Association, the American Football Coaches Association and the NCAA competitive safeguards committee. It's designed to allow coaches to utilize contact during spring practice, yet limit the number of 11-on-11 drills in which most of the injuries occur. So we urge your support so that Division II will be in conformance with I-A and I-AA. Thank you.

William F. Arnet (University of Missouri, Columbia): I am chair of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports. I rise to speak in support of Proposal No. 7.

This legislation was initiated, as has been mentioned, by the American Football Coaches Association, the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, with input from the collegiate commissioners national association of trainers, the NCAA student advisory committee, and various medical organizations.

The Division I Management Council has approved this proposal. The goal of the legislation is to coach student-athletes to play college football as it should be played—in the safest manner possible.

The changes to the current spring football legislation were based in large part on the definitive data from the Association's injury surveillance system. This data, provided by athletic trainers from around the country, were essential in providing guidance in creating a proposal that will allow coaches to teach the skills of the game with less risk of serious injury. Such an injury has a direct effect on the individual and the team as well as the institutions.

It's anticipated that spring practice legislation will reduce serious injury rates. However, the AFCA and the competitive safeguards committee have agreed to thoroughly reevaluate the injury data in three years in order to validate that assumption. If this legislation passes, the AFCA and the competitive safeguards committee are prepared to provide educational material immediately to coaches, student-athletes and medical personnel. In conclusion, the competitive safeguards committee, with the NCAA student advisory committee, the American Football Coaches Association and several medical organizations, agree that this legislation, which addresses the type of contact conducted in spring football, has great potential to reduce serious injury.

In addition, there is a mechanism in place—the injury surveillance system—to monitor the effectiveness of the legislation and a willingness among all parties to revisit the issue if necessary.

Therefore, on behalf of all of us concerned about the welfare of the football student-athlete, I urge your consideration and support of this legislation.

Todd W. Henne (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Edinboro University of Pennsylvania): We are in support of Proposal 7.

Currently, student-athletes suffer serious injuries two to three times more often in spring practice than in fall practice. At no time should an athlete be subject to greater incident of injury out of season than in season. That does not make sense.

Proposal No. 7 is taking into account the data from the injury surveillance system to devise a plan, that if implemented properly by the coaching staff, has the potential to reduce the alarming rate of injuries to student-athletes.

We would like to encourage each institution to comply with not only the letter of the law, but the spirit of the law. We feel that is the key. It must be

noted that when this plan is revisited for its effectiveness, the coaches must know that if this is not successful, serious action must be taken to protect the student-athletes in the future from this high and alarming rate of injury. Thank you.

[Proposal No 7 (Page A-6) was adopted, 117-8-4.]

Financial Aid—Pell Grants—Division II

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I would like to move Proposal No. 3.

[The motion was seconded.]

I was surprised it did not get moved earlier, but this is a very simple matter to me. As far as I can tell, it's a matter of student-athlete welfare. Our colleagues in Division I did this two years ago and it behooves us to do the same thing. This is simply a matter of fairness, ladies and gentlemen. If an interpretation is to be made, I think that it can be clarified later on. But I propose we vote for this. I think the student-athlete benefits. Thank you.

Brett Evilsizor (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Presbyterian College): In regard to the issue of the Pell Grants, we feel this would be fulfilling the needs of the student-athletes. The student-athletes who qualify for Pell Grant qualify because of financial need. These moneys that could be allocated to them will be money due to the student-athlete. They are entitled to this money and it will benefit them.

Also, we would like to bring up the part of equity and fairness. As student-athletes, we keep saying don't treat us special. Don't treat us any better, but don't treat us any worse. If we can receive a full academic scholarship and qualify but can't receive a Pell Grant because of our athletics scholarship, we are getting treated in a worse capacity. So we are in favor of this legislation.

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): I have another interpretation question. Based on how this is worded, would it be permissible to give a partial athletics scholarship, add the Pell Grant to that scholarship so that it takes you up to less than a full grant-in-aid and still use the Pell Grant, even if the scholarship is less than a full grant-in-aid?

David L. Schnase (NCAA Staff): You would not take into account the partial scholarship at all. If this is adopted, you get to have as much of the Pell Grant as you are entitled to.

Ms. Cerra: Even if it's under a full grant-in-aid?

Mr. Schnase: Even if it's under a full grant-in-aid.

[Proposal No. 3 (Page A-3) was adopted, 124-83-1.]

Mr. Herbert: That concludes the items that are part of the presidential grouping. We will now proceed to Proposal No. 8. The balance of these proposals do not require roll-call votes. We now have Proposal No. 8 on the floor. Is there a motion with regard to Proposal No. 8?

Educational Expenses—National Governing Bodies

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): As a member of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the Division II Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 8.

[The motion was seconded.]

Three years ago, the NCAA overwhelmingly established an exception that permits an individual to receive educational expenses from the United States Olympic Committee, provided the award is included in the team's financial aid limit and the individual's choice of institutions is not restricted. That

rule change has allowed some institutions to cut scholarship cost for selected student-athletes, and no recruiting abuses or other problems have surfaced as a result of this new exception.

The proposal before us today is designed to extend the current opportunity for educational expenses from national governing bodies. This is an important step for those national governing bodies—like USA Gymnastics—that have established grant programs as a strategy to prevent the further decrease in collegiate programs in their sports. This proposal has been studied for a year-and-a-half by the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee with assistance from the Recruiting Committee. Both committees have recommended adoption of the proposal. The Division I Board of Directors recently approved this same rule change for Division I.

On behalf of the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the Management Council, I urge you to vote yes for Proposal No. 8. Thank you.

Robert A. Burnett (Armstrong Atlantic State University): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council, I would like to note that the Presidents Council agreed to sponsor this proposal after receiving strong recommendations from the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the Division II Management Council.

The Presidents Council recognized the potential cost savings associated with the legislative change. In addition, this proposal provides assistance to Olympic sports, including some that are in decline in Division II institutions.

For these reasons, I urge you to support Proposal No. 8.

[Proposal No. 8 (Page A-8) was adopted.]

De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

Carol M. Dunn (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 9.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the last three Conventions, the membership adopted legislation that eliminated the responsibility of each institution to declare a student-athlete or prospect ineligible for small, inconsequential types of violations. These types of violations do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or student-athlete and the institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage.

It is important to note, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those in this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff. One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution and institutional employees. The only difference is that the eligibility of innocent prospects or student-athletes will not be affected.

The Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement believes that this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of de minimis violations that currently affect student prospects' or student-athletes' eligibility. The Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement strongly urges your support, and I do as well. Thank you.

Jerry E. McGee (Wingate University): As a member of the Presidents Council, I would like to note that the Presidents Council agreed to sponsor this proposal after considering the recommendations from both the former Eligibility Committee and the Division II Management Council. The Presidents Council believes that this legislative change is appropriate and

that it will greatly assist the membership in a number of circumstances in which an institution will not need to seek restoration on behalf of a prospective or student-athlete. I urge you to support this proposal.

[Proposal No. 9 (Page A-9) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefit

Carol M. Dunn (California State University, Los Angeles): On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 10.

[The motion was seconded.]

These restitution proposals are a new concept created by the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement. They are designed to eliminate the ineligibility component for those violations of NCAA rules in which the action by the committee is to require repayment or restitution in order for the student-athlete or prospect to regain his or her eligibility.

These proposals will not require the involved institution to seek reinstatement of eligibility; rather, these proposals require the student-athlete or prospect to repay the value of the benefit in order to regain eligibility status. The student-athlete or prospect remains ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the prospect repays the benefit. The stated value of the benefit or inducement in each bylaw is \$25 or less.

It is important to note that all violations of NCAA rules including those in this proposal remain violations that have institutional responsibility. Additionally, the documentation of repayment shall be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff with the institution's self-report.

The Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement believes that this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of violations that currently affect our prospects' or student-athletes' eligibility. The committee strongly urges your support of this proposal, and I do as well. Thank you.

Joan K. Wadlow (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I'm speaking on behalf of the Presidents Council and urge your strong support for this particular proposal. The Presidents Council agreed to support Proposal 10 after considering recommendations from the former Eligibility Committee and the Division II Management Council.

The Presidents Council agrees that this legislation helps streamline and simplify the process that is needed to restore a student-athlete's eligibility when a person has received certain improper benefits.

Personally, I like the description of the review committee from the faculty rep association because it describes the advantages very succinctly. This proposal increases institutional control, and it is more timely and efficient than the present procedure. I urge your support.

[Proposal No. 10 (Page A-10) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Joint College/High-School Program

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): I'm the faculty representative at Augusta State University and chair of the Academic Requirements Committee. On behalf of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 11.

[The motion was seconded.]

Proposal No. 11 is designed to permit an outstanding student-athlete who is enrolled in a joint college/high-school program to participate in extracurricular activities, other than intercollegiate athletics, without utilizing the

term of eligibility, provided the student is classified as a special student and is not considered by the college to be regularly matriculated.

There has been an increase in the number of high-school students who have been taking courses at collegiate institutions. In many cases, the student-athlete is eligible to participate in the college's extracurricular activities. Under such circumstances, a prospective student-athlete who is enrolled in a joint college/high-school academic program should not utilize a term of eligibility, provided the student is not eligible for intercollegiate athletics at the collegiate institution.

The Division II Academic Requirements Committee urges you to support Proposal No. 11.

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): As a member of the Division II Presidents Council and that group's liaison to the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, I urge your support of Proposal No. 11.

The Presidents Council agreed to support this proposal after reviewing the recommendations from the former Academic Requirements Committee and the Division II Management Council. The Presidents Council agreed that due to increasing numbers of high-school students who are enrolling in courses at Division II institutions, the joint college/high school bylaw must be clarified. This legislation will specify the conditions that must be met not to trigger a student's 10 semesters of eligibility rule. I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 11 (Page A-14) was adopted.]

Eligibility—One-Time Transfer Exception—Division II

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): I stand to move Proposal No. 12.

[The motion was seconded.]

Basically, this proposal permits a student-athlete who has full-time attendance at an institution but does not participate or does not receive athletically related aid a subsequent transfer without triggering the one-time transfer exception.

We have found that in many instances student-athletes are victims of circumstance or misfortune. They leave one institution, wind up at another one and do not elect to participate. They may not be talented enough to participate, or whatever the situation may be. They are then punished when they then seek to transfer to another institution.

We think this is fair. We think this would save the Administrative Review Panel a great many cases. I know it would lessen the load on a lot of athletics directors and administrators in processing these kinds of cases. We seek your support.

Jerry M. Hughes (Central Missouri State University): Nate, I need a clarification on one item. If a student-athlete attends Institution A, competes and then leaves Institution A and does not compete or receive aid at Institution B, when the student-athlete transfers to Institution C, the athletics director at Institution C would obviously contact the athletics director at Institution B to find out if he or she did not compete or participate. Would they also have to receive one-time transfer information from Institution A?

Mr. Salant: I think that that is something interpretation-wise that we would have to refer to Dave for an answer on in terms of compliance with NCAA rules.

Mr. Schnase: Are you asking in terms of which institution they are seek-

ing to find out if a student-athlete was making satisfactory progress toward a degree?

Mr. Hughes: With our one-time transfer legislation, the athletics director from the institution in which a student-athlete is transferring from has the opportunity to release that student-athlete if he or she determines they should do so. My concern is if the institution in which the student-athlete participated at does not continue to retain that release responsibility, there is the potential for tampering.

Mr. Schnase: It's my understanding, Nate, and correct me if I'm wrong, that this proposal simply takes out of the loop the institution in which the student-athlete does not participate or receive aid. So if the student-athlete goes to Institution A, participates, goes to B, doesn't participate or receive aid and then goes to C, Institution C then goes back and contacts Institution A for the purpose of the one-time transfer exception.

Mr. Salant: That is correct. That is the essence of our conversation on this topic.

Mr. Hughes: Would that be the interpretation?

Mr. Schnase: That appears to be the intent of the sponsors.

Mr. Hughes: Okay. Thank you.

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): As chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, and on behalf of the Division II committee, I rise to oppose this proposal.

While we do agree that the specified intent of the legislation may allow greater flexibility for some students, we in academic requirements do have some major concerns about its implementation. Specifically, the expectation of satisfactory progress toward a degree is compromised with this proposal. Under this proposal, one four-year institution that a student previously attended would be eliminated entirely from the satisfactory-progress requirements.

The interpretation of this proposal indicated that the student would immediately participate athletically as long as he or she would have been eligible at the previous institution where he or she participated athletically. This institution may be either the first or the second four-year institution. There would be no academic requirements that would be expected from attendance at the other previous institution.

The student-athlete is not held responsible for any transferable hours or grades from the other institution, regardless of the length of attendance because this school is removed from the loop. There is, in fact, no minimum time of attendance in that second institution.

There is the current appeal process that does allow the leave for students who legitimately have transferred from two four-year institutions and who wish to attend a third and participate athletically.

J. Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): Just a clarification if I could get one, please.

If I understand this, if an athlete participated at Institution A, transferred to Institution B, tried out at Institution B, did not make the team, flunked out of Institution B, did not receive any credit hours, goes to Institution C, that athlete would be eligible at Institution C providing the athlete had, in fact, passed 24 credit hours at the first institution?

In other words, we are taking the provisions of 14.4.3.1-(a), which require an athlete or a student to pass 12 hours per semester of attendance at a four-year institution, and we are going to waive that for the second institution, provided they did not participate? Is that correct?

Mr. Schnase: That appears to be a possible outcome of this proposal.

Mr. Capon: On the other hand, as I read this legislation, if the athlete or the student attended Institution A, did not participate, then went to Institution B and participated, they would have to have met satisfactory progress at Institution A because they were enrolled full time at that institution, or is that going to be waived as well?

Mr. Schnase: No. In that case, they would have to make satisfactory progress at the institution in which they competed or participated, which in your scenario, was Institution B.

Mr. Capon: But they could meet satisfactory progress could they not? Satisfactory progress can be met one of two ways. You could even pass 24 hours the previous year or you can pass an average of 12 over all years of attendance. Are we going to say that that first institution is still excluded as counting?

Mr. Schnase: I believe Bylaw 14.4.3.4.10 says you can't use credit at a previous institution to meet satisfactory progress.

Mr. Capon: Thank you.

G. Jean Cerra (Barry University): Is there anything in the legislation that precludes them from transferring at mid-year? In other words, isn't there a one-year residence requirement at that institution at which they are not participating or receiving financial aid?

Mr. Schnase: There is no residence requirement.

Ms. Cerra: So, in essence, they could be at Institution A intending to go to Institution C, go to Institution B for one term, not receive any aid or participate, and be immediately eligible in January to participate at Institution C?

Mr. Schnase: That appears to be a potential outcome of this proposal.

Ms. Cerra: That's what I thought, thanks.

[Proposal No. 12 (Page A-15) was defeated.]

Mr. Herbert: It is now 10 o'clock. I'm wondering if we'd like to take a break right now. Let me suggest this might be a good time to do that. Why don't we reconvene in about 12 minutes.

[A recess was taken.]

We will please come to order. Now that our 12-minute break has concluded, we are ready to get started. The chair will recognize microphone six.

Mr. Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): Earlier this morning, we debated Proposal No. 4, which dealt with the equivalency limits for cross country and track. When we voted on that issue, which had a considerable amount of debate, the recorded vote was 89 in favor, 28 opposed, nine abstentions. This either indicates that over 100 of the institutions chose to cast no vote at all or there may have been a malfunction in the voting process. I therefore request the chair consider asking the membership to vote on this issue again.

Mr. Herbert: The request is that we vote again on this issue. In taking this action, there would be no discussion. It is not a vote to reconsider. It is simply to assure that we did not have a mechanical error in recording your vote.

The chair will ask that the issue be brought back before us. We will vote again on Proposal No. 4—Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits. Let me ask you once again to pull out your voting machines.

The polls are now open on Proposal No. 4. Please cast your votes.

Thank you, very much. The polls are closed. We will now proceed to Proposal No. 13. Is there a motion related to Proposal No. 13?

Playing and Practice Seasons— Division II Basketball—Annual Exemptions

Mike Marcil (North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I move Proposal No. 13.

[The motion was seconded.]

Members of the North Central Conference and the Northern Sun Conference support this proposal.

This is permissive legislation. It does not add additional athletics contests; however, it does provide institutions with the flexibility to be able to play two exhibition contests against a foreign team as opposed to one in the institution's own arena.

Albert J. Shannon (Saint Joseph's College, Indiana): I'd like to note that the Presidents Council agreed to support this proposal after reviewing recommendations from the Management Council.

The Presidents Council agreed with the Management Council that this legislation will provide an institution with greater flexibility in scheduling exhibition basketball games and does not increase the number of permissible games for the institution.

The Presidents Council urges your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 13 (Page A-16) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons— Division II Basketball—Annual Exemptions

Kurt L. Patberg (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference): I move Proposal 14.

[The motion was seconded.]

The train appears to be rolling again, and I don't want to stop it. This is pretty clear legislation. It just adds two games against club members in the years that you do not use the two foreign contests.

Mr. Shannon: Same speech, same reasons. The Presidents Council urges your support.

[Proposal No. 14 (Page A-17) was adopted.]

Playing and Practice Seasons—Swimming and Diving

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): On behalf of the Division II Management Council and Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 15.

[The motion was seconded.]

Arend D. Lubbers (Grand Valley State University): The Presidents Council agreed to sponsor this proposal after reviewing the recommendations from the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee and the Division II Management Council. The Presidents Council recognizes the unique situation involving the calendar for the sport of diving, and it believes that this legislation will remedy this problem.

I urge you to support this proposal.

Mr. Dillon: Proposal No. 15 is designed to correct a problem caused by the fact that the NCAA playing- and practice-season regulations for the sport of swimming also apply in total to the sport of diving. Unfortunately, circumstances unique to the sport of diving have not been fully accommodated.

About a year ago, the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee was made aware

that because of these swimming regulations and the timing of the United States diving national championship, diving student-athletes selected to participate in that national governing body championship were not allowed in most cases to work with their coaches before and during that championship.

This proposal, which was almost adopted noncontroversially by the former NCAA Council, will correct the problem while preventing abusive practice time restrictions by requiring each diving student-athlete to engage in no more than 144 days of practice.

The Management Council and Olympic Sports Liaison Committee urge you to support Proposal No. 15. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 15 (Page A-18) was adopted.]

Tryouts—Enrolled Students

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): I am moving Proposal No. 16.

[The motion was seconded.]

Very briefly, this creates an opportunity for student-athletes who are currently enrolled full time at Division II institutions to tryout out of season or in preseason in a very, very limited opportunity, with no more than three such opportunities in a given sport in a given academic year.

This addresses a need of students who are already in attendance and need to make plans as to whether or not they really are talented enough to participate in a particular sport. That may impact the student-athlete's decision to either transfer at some point or get a part-time job or engage in other extracurricular activities.

It's ironic that we currently allow tryouts for high-school students before they even apply at the institution, but we do not permit currently enrolled students to have the same opportunity. Please understand that we tightened this up after the first version of it to address the concerns about endless tryouts and that type of thing. That would not be a problem as it is currently written.

[Proposal No. 16 (Page A-19) was adopted.]

Enforcement—Penalties for Secondary Violations

Mr. Salant: I didn't realize we were back to back. I move No. 17.

[The motion was seconded.]

There has been a great deal of discussion about this outside the meeting. It is very important to understand exactly what this legislation would do.

It permits the conference commissioners to handle the first-time offense in certain specific secondary violations. It requires that the Committee on Infractions in Division II provide a list, an actual chart, specifying those secondary violations and listing exactly what the penalties are and what the enforcement procedure is.

It creates consistency. It also creates awareness because it takes that veil of secrecy out of the process. People will know that if a student-athlete was given meal money on a day when there should not have been meal money, here is the penalty.

Furthermore, it's only usable the first time that the infraction occurs in a particular sport. All that this does is offer the commissioners the opportunity to speed up the process. I emphasize to you that it does not create the possibility of inconsistency. Instead, it creates consistency because the penalties are specifically prescribed.

We also think it creates relief for many institutions because they will know that if they committed a secondary violation, here's the penalty and let's move on with the process. We think it will speed up the time factor as well.

That has been a factor for us in several instances with violations that have been reported. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 17 (Page A-21) was defeated.]

NCAA Core-Course Review Committee

Allen Lee Sessoms (Queens College, New York): On behalf of the Division II Presidents Council, I move Proposal 18.

[The motion was seconded.]

As the Presidents Council liaison to the Division II Academic Requirements Committee, I am aware of how important it is for Division II to have autonomy in the area of rules and regulations concerning academic requirements for Division II institutions. However, it is equally important that the NCAA preserve some common policies and procedures in the area of initial eligibility that will ensure that Divisions I and II student-athletes are treated the same.

One critical area of the common policies and procedures is the identification of core courses for the initial-eligibility clearinghouse. This legislation will establish a committee of Division I and Division II administrators to carry out this function in a consistent manner for both Divisions I and II student-athletes. I urge your support for this proposal.

Robert T. Becker (Saginaw Valley State University): As a member of the Management Council and the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee, I urge your support of this proposal. The process of using a clearinghouse to determine the initial eligibility of prospective student-athletes has improved dramatically during the last 12 months.

Many in Division II question whether we should return to certifying initial eligibility on our campuses. That is a discussion for a later date. Today, we have an opportunity to continue to improve the process of certifying initial eligibility that we are required to use by current legislation. Most of the delays involving the certification of prospective student-athletes occur as a result of questions involving core courses. This legislation will establish a committee to continue the core-course review work that is being performed by the former Academic Requirements Committee. It will ensure consistent application of core-course issues for Divisions I and II student-athletes.

For these reasons, I urge your support of this proposal.

[Proposal No. 18 (Page A-22) was adopted.]

Division II Men's and Women's Tennis Committee

Oscar L. Prater (Fort Valley State University): On behalf of the Presidents Council, I move Proposal No. 19.

[The motion was seconded.]

Based on the recommendations from the Division II Management Council, the Division II Championships Committee and the tennis committee, the Presidents Council has agreed to sponsor this proposal to increase the number of representatives on the Division II Tennis Committee.

The Presidents Council understands how important it is to have regional representation on sports committees. Since tennis is the only team sports committee in which the committee's composition does not match the sports regional alignment, it seems obvious that that needs to be corrected.

The legislation before us speaks to this flaw in the Division II sports committee structure. We urge your support.

Pamela L. Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): The Management

Council recommended this legislation to the Presidents Council and it urges your support.

Currently, the team sports of men's and women's tennis has four regions for each championships, but only three representatives for men's tennis interests and three representatives for women's tennis interests. This legislation will guarantee a representative on the sports committee for men's tennis and women's tennis interests from each geographical region in Division II. I urge your support for this proposal.

[Proposal No. 19 (Page A-23) was adopted.]

FORUMS

Mr. Herbert: That concludes the legislative actions before us today. Let me remind you that there will be a "window of reconsideration" opportunity available immediately after lunch. If action is not taken at that time for reconsideration, there will be no further opportunities for legislative consideration during this Convention.

At this time, let me thank our parliamentarian for all of the help, assistance and support this morning. We'll see you this afternoon just in case.

We're now ready to begin a very important component of this Convention in our business session. Several forum presentations and discussions will now take place related to issues that have been identified as being of particular importance to the Division II membership.

I hope that each of you will take the opportunity to express your views and also to raise questions during these discussion forums. I just want to reiterate that these are very critical issues for the division. We need your input and feedback as we continue to progress through the governance structure.

We will begin with a discussion about championships. I'd like to ask Clint Bryant, who is director of athletics at Augusta State University, vice-chair of the Division II Management Council and chair of the Division II Championships Committee, to lead the presentation.

CHAMPIONSHIPS

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): Thank you, Dr. Herbert, for this opportunity to discuss the Division II championship situation.

First of all, at the head table with me is Bob Becker, director of athletics at Saginaw Valley State University and a member of the Division II Championships Committee. Bill Lide, the director of athletics at North Carolina Central University and a member of the Division II Championships Committee. Dennis Poppe, NCAA director of championships and primary liaison to the Division II Championships Committee. Tom Jacobs, NCAA senior assistant director of championships and secondary liaison to the Division II Championships Committee.

The Championships Committee has met twice in person, last August and again in September, when it conducted a first-ever meeting of the chairs of all Division II governing sports committees to discuss championships issues that again will be discussed today with the Division II membership.

Part of the charge of the Championships Committee from the Presidents Commission was to review the Division II championship programs, its current state of affairs, our policies and procedure. The Championships Committee spent a considerable amount of time putting together the information in a document titled "Overview of the NCAA Division II Championships Program." It was mailed to chief executive officers, faculty

athletics representatives, senior woman administrators and directors of athletics at each Division II institution December 14, 1997. In addition, the document was sent to all Division II conference commissioners and the Division II Student-Athlete Advisory Committee.

Three points should be made in referencing the document. First, the information contained in the document is not new. It was pulled from a variety of sources including championship handbooks and Division II manuals. Secondly, there will be no change to the policies and procedures outlined in the document for the current academic year. Rather, the current policies will be reviewed and confirmed or modified for future years. Thirdly, the document will not become a stand-alone piece. The policies and procedures contained in the document will be reincorporated back into the various championship handbooks and other publications as appropriate.

The reasons we are here today is to conduct a healthy discussion of the current policies and procedures to see if we need to examine the possibility of making any changes for future years.

Before we engage in that discussion, I would like to take a minute to recognize the members of the Division II Championships Committee. I've already introduced Bob Becker from Saginaw Valley and Bill Lide from North Carolina Central University. But also on that committee, if you will please stand, is Rita Castagna, we always tease her it rhymes with lasagna, from Assumption College, director of athletics. Gail Cummings-Danson, associate director of athletics at The State University of New York at Albany. Sallie Dalton, senior woman administrator and compliance coordinator at the University of Central Arkansas. Joe Donahue, director of athletics, California State University, Stanislaus. Fred Jacoby, commissioner of the Lone Star Conference. Tom Kearns, faculty athletics representative, professor of mathematics at Northern Kentucky University. Barb Schroeder, director of athletics, Regis University (Colorado). Because of the move of Earl Edwards from East Stroudsburg, we do have a vacancy to be filled on the committee.

At this time, I would also like to recognize the sports committee chairs. If you would stand at this time. We owe these people a round of applause for their dedication.

Now, back to the issues. When the overview document was mailed, the Championships Committee also provided a separate document with issues raised in the selection of championships participants and application of site determination policies. These are issues that were identified by the Championships Committee and chairs of the various Division II governing sports committees.

Before we begin the discussions of these issues, I would urge you to keep your comments relative to such issues and not allow the discussion to turn into a gripe session of how your team didn't get selected, didn't get to host and et cetera. If you will refer to the handout you received today, we will take the issues in order as they appear on the handout. At the end of the discussion regarding each topic, we may call for a straw vote to determine the membership's opinion. It should be noted that the reason for doing so is to gain input. The Division II Championships Committee will take this information and will review all the issues to determine what change or modifications, if any, should be made for future years.

The Division II committee formed a subcommittee chaired by Bob Becker to refute some of these issues. At this time, I would like to bring Bob to the microphone.

Robert T. Becker (Saginaw Valley State University): Thanks, Clint.

The Subcommittee on the Selection of Championship Participants conducted a conference call early in September to discuss the selection criteria that are listed in Bylaw 31.3.3, namely the won-and-lost record, the strength of schedule, and the eligibility and availability of student-athletes. In addition, the subcommittee reviewed additional selection criteria that are used by governing sports committees.

The only action taken by the Championships Committee that will be effective this year was to mandate that all governing sports committees that select teams and/or individuals for championship competition should include as a part of their selection criteria consideration of the won-lost record versus Division II opponents within the region. Again, within the region.

There were a number of other issues that were raised by the subcommittee in conducting its research. I think Clint is going to cover that now. Thank you.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you, Bob.

In your overview document, we said that we would be receiving some financial information in December. We have just received that information. To update you, 5,825 student-athletes participated last year in Division II championships; transportation expense was \$3,351,151; per diem expenses were \$1,590,000; and operating costs were \$5,609,151, which was a 23-percent increase from the previous year. We wanted to update you on that.

Our first issue is the strength of schedule. The question is: "What methods may be used to better evaluate the strength of schedule?" Would anyone like to speak to the strength of schedule; how we may better accommodate the strength of schedule?

Peter Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): The strength of schedule is such an important criterion when we use it this way. But we haven't been able to come up with any real definition of what strength of schedule is. I'm not trying to be facetious, but why is it such an important part of the criteria?

Mr. Bryant: As you can see by the handout, we don't in Division II have access to an objective computer-generated Ratings Percentage Index. Basically, if there is a difference of opinion already developed, but we think in the cold concept of regionalization, strength of schedule is something to be considered. That's what sports committees and our advisory committees base that on. To say exactly what it is, it's just independent opinions or what. So you would suggest better evaluation of strength of schedule or if it should even be an issue?

Mr. Chapman: I've been on several regional advisory committees. It seems if we have five people on a regional advisory committee, we've got five different thoughts about what strength of schedule is because it's not very well defined. If we look in the book, in the criteria for selection, we've got won-lost record, we've got strength of schedule and we have the availability and the eligibility of the athletes. We've got three things. For one of them, we can't seem to find a definition that we can all use, but yet it's one of three important criteria to determine who goes.

If we can't come up with a very strong definition of what it is, then maybe we shouldn't use it if it's so subjective.

Dennis L. Poppe (NCAA Staff): There is a definition in the overview document. We do attempt to describe what it is. It is at best subjective, but there is a basic principle behind it. For example, in football, two institutions can

compile a 10-1 record, but who were those 10 opponents? If that one institution had a stronger schedule, it would be deserving to be considered as the top-ranked team.

Your evaluation of the strength of schedule is based on head-to-head competition, common opponents you have played and so forth. With regionalization, we have a better chance of doing that because you have more opponents within your regions and more common scores to compare.

Mr. Chapman: But if you have several conferences and there is very little crossover, what determines which one of those conferences has a better strength of schedule?

Even though we say those things that you just repeated, it really does not happen if you sit five people down to try to make a decision about strength of schedule. It doesn't come out right or there is nothing there that really gives you anything to make evaluations on.

Mr. Poppe: I would agree. If you are trying to compare a team in California to a team on the East coast or even within your region, as you allude to, sometimes your two conferences do not have interregional play.

But that's what we attempted to do in the Division II Championships Committee years ago when it developed the concept of regionalization to promote more interregional play, to develop more common opponents and more head-to-head competition so that you can compare. I think the story was given years ago by a sports committee that was trying to compare three teams in three different parts of the country. To go to what you are saying, how do you compare them when you have no common data? It does become a subjective evaluation. That's why all these policies and procedures have been developed to try to be as objective as possible in your evaluations.

No, it is not a foolproof system. You are going to have situations where it does come to a judgment factor.

Mr. Chapman: So it's not going to be subjective.

Mr. Poppe: There is no way you can eliminate that unless you always have head-to-head or common opponents. Unfortunately, that's not the situation.

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): He sort of touched on the comments that I was going to make about strength of schedule as objective criteria because of the lack of interregional competition.

What it really boils down to is whether or not a conference has been defined as a strong basketball conference. Oftentimes when you start the evaluation process, you know who played each other in the conference. But you don't have any cross-regional play, so when you look at common opponents and head-to-head competition, oftentimes there is none when you look at the various conferences within the region.

I think if strength of schedule is going to continue to be used as objective criteria, then we also need to look at interregional scheduling.

Mr. Bryant: One of the things that we have been trying to promote since the whole regionalization concept began is that teams within regions would, in fact, compete against one another. I think that's something that will be discussed later today when we discuss the whole concept of regionalization.

There are people within regions who are ducking one another and not playing one another based on the quality of competition in a given conference. Through the selection process that we're going through, schools not selected because of the strength of schedule, will be forced into competing against the schools that are considered the better competitive schools within a region.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I

don't believe Division II needs to get overly concerned about developing computer-generated type data. Anything that you put together from a computer standpoint is going to have some subjectivity tied to it.

For example, Division I's vaunted RPI is not the same today as it was five years ago because they have changed the weight in which they give different criteria or different things within that scheduling.

I have faith in the committees and the manner in which they believe they can best select the teams based on what they view as subjective criteria. We understand strength of schedule is always going to have some subjectivity in it. You can quantify a certain aspect of that, such as winning teams, teams you played with winning records and losing records. But I would not want from the Division II standpoint for us to think that we've got to find computer-generated programs to determine teams that we've selected.

I have faith in the men and women who are on those committees evaluating strength of schedule from their own perspective that they'll come up with the teams that deserve to be in that respective championship.

I encourage the committee to try to get more commonality, but I don't believe we can fit every sport within the same criteria because the sports are different. They have different venues in which they play and different criteria. I don't believe what works for one necessarily works for the other.

Pamela L. Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): Having served on several sports committees, I would like to encourage the Championships Committee to look at the potential of having each sports committee determine if it is possible to come up with an objective strength-of-schedule index for their sport.

Following up on the last speaker, I would agree that this should not be the only criterion that's used in evaluating the strength of schedule. But having been a member of those committees, the more objective material that we do have makes it a much easier decision when we get to the final analysis.

I'm going to agree that you do need some subjective evaluation in that process, but if we had a strength-of-schedule index that was developed by each individual sports committee that was relevant to their sport, I don't believe that each sport would have the same strength-of-schedule index because of the differences.

I encourage the Championships Committee to determine if it would be feasible to have those sports committees look at developing objective criteria that will give coaches as they schedule games some idea of what's going to be included when they are evaluated on their strength of schedule. Thank you.

Ed B. Harris (West Texas A&M University): I believe we will continue to have these subjective characteristics within strength-of-schedule criterion, but if we stick with regionalization, I think you diminish that.

Where I have a problem—and I brought this up last year—was when a regional committee is using strength of schedule and rates the teams. This happened to our team the year before in soccer. The regional committee ranked them No. 3 in the region. The national committee overturned that and brought the No. 5 team into the mix. When you started allowing this concept, then strength of schedule shouldn't be a factor at the national level. That should be left at level No. 1.

If they've determined the strength of schedule and ranked their teams, then I don't believe the national committee should overturn that. You are

allowing teams that have the budget to travel nationally to influence votes in other parts of the country. I think that does skew the issue.

Nathan N. Salant (Gulf South Conference): There is a problem with the strength of schedule that we run into and it goes hand-in-hand with the concept of regionalization. Let's face it, many teams duck other teams and other institutions refuse to come out of their local area to play outside of their state or their immediate area. This literally undermines the regionalization concept.

You can tell someone the schedule is not strong enough and that institution can say it tried to schedule 19 other teams in its region that are not in the conference and they wouldn't play us. Others said we'll play, but you have to come here every time. Although that's on the agenda later today, that really needs to be looked at. I don't know if there is a solution, but we need to focus on it.

Robert M. De Gregorio Jr. (Merrimack College): As the previous speaker alluded to, I thought regionalization was to promote more Division II competition and prevent people from padding their schedule with NAIA schools or Division III competition after they got through with their conference that they would beat up easily and, as the previous speaker alluded to, duck other strong Division II programs from other areas. Although I think it may have to be looked at, I think some subjective input is important on institutions that avoid playing Division II competition.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you. We're not really hearing any suggestions about what methods we could use. One thing we did hear is that maybe we should consider an index with some objective criteria. I think everyone understands what the strength of schedule and the whole concept of regionalization is all about.

I think the only way we're going to be able to curtail some of that activity is to not select teams for championships if they are not participating from a regional standpoint. That has happened in a number of sports in which they have to strengthen their schedule and play some tougher competition.

Let's move on to additional criteria. Should all governing sports committees utilize some basic additional criteria, then have the autonomy to consider some sport-specific criteria? Another suggestion that has been considered is to require all teams being considered for at-large selections to have at least a .500 won-lost record. Is there any discussion on additional criteria?

Would it be appropriate at this time to take a straw vote? I want to take a straw vote on the idea of people with less than a .500 record being considered as additional criteria. My question is: "Should any team being considered for at-large selection have at least a .500 won-lost record?" All in favor of that, would you please raise your paddle? Thank you. All opposed? Thank you.

Let's move on to No. 3—multiple conference selection. "Should there be a limitation as to the number of teams that may be selected from a conference?" We'd like to have your input there. Should there be limitations as to the number of teams that may be selected from a conference?

Mr. Battle: Clint, I don't know whether there should be a limitation or not, but I certainly think the composition of conferences ought to be looked at. Some conferences have 12 or 14 members and another conference has six. Is it fair for the six-member conference to get four selections in men and women's basketball and the conference with 12 or 14 to just get four? That

should be a consideration rather than a limitation. The membership should be looked at very, very carefully.

Mr. Bryant: All in favor of setting limitation as to the number of teams that may be selected from a conference, would you raise your paddle? Seeing none, all opposed to setting limitations on a conference? Okay. Good.

Let's look at the automatic qualification questionnaire. No. 4: "Is automatic qualification still applicable in Division II?" If you read your document, we do still have automatic qualification as it relates to men's and women's basketball. That's been based on the enhancement funds that we receive from that.

There is a question out there among conferences. Should there be conference access for Division II championships?

Jo Spearman (Mississippi University for Women): I may be a little slow, but I want to back up to No. 2, the additional criteria for selection.

You asked for suggestions. There was much discussion about out-of-region competition. A suggestion might be to do a certain percentage of both in your region and out of your region to help force the issue and give some basis for regionalization in competition. Sorry about that.

Mr. Bryant: No, thank you. I think that's a very valid point.

Mr. Battle: I don't want to hog the microphone on this particular issue, but in terms of automatic qualification, I'd like to carry the discussion a little bit further about the number of members from a particular conference.

My opinion is that a conference ought to be of a particular size in terms of membership in order to qualify for automatic qualification. In fact, when I was on the men's basketball committee, one of the ideas that I supported was that a conference should have at least a minimum of eight members in order to be considered for automatic qualification. I strongly believe that ought to be considered when you are awarding automatic qualification to conferences. Then, as the Division II membership grows, particularly in some sports, you get so many conferences with a small number of members that the automatic qualifications nearly lock up all of the slots and make it tough for institutions who may not be members of a conference. Everybody grouped together to form small conferences oftentimes with the purposes of getting an automatic qualification to championships, I think that needs to be looked at.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I believe automatic qualification is an important aspect in Division II. I would like to see it continue, particularly in men's and women's basketball.

I would like the committees to consider looking at that possibly on a regional basis because I think it adds a lot to a conference when you have an automatic berth for the teams. It adds to the manner in which they conduct themselves in play throughout the season. I would encourage the committee to look at that.

I believe the answer to your question "is it applicable?" is yes, I think it's very applicable in Division II. I don't particularly believe that if you have automatic qualification everybody ought to have it. I don't believe that's the value of automatic qualification. Those who don't have it, have to get better. I think that's part of the system.

We are in a competitive environment, we keep score, we win, we lose games. I don't believe automatic qualification is something you give in a sport that everybody can have a piece of. There is nothing wrong with evaluating teams and conferences and determining those that have it and those that don't. If

my conference has to be one that doesn't have it, we would try to find a way to work to get better. That's what this environment is about, college athletics. So I would encourage us to stay with that and consider expanding it possibly on a regional basis.

Jane Meier (Northern Kentucky University): I'm going to take a position that's probably unpopular, especially with the last speaker, but I believe in fairness. I've been on sports committees since the early 1980s, and we try very, very hard to be as fair as we can. But there are things going on within our sports that I think we're not maybe in tune to. Coaches are doing the scheduling. They are putting themselves in closed-shop situations. I'm a proponent of looking at automatic qualifiers for all of our sports for all of our conferences into each NCAA championship. I know this is unpopular but we've got to come to terms with what's actually going on with these schedules.

If I could give you some examples: top teams will only play—and these have been discussed earlier with the strength of schedule—at home or they won't play you at all. Teams are forced to travel to play key games. They might be able to get that scheduled game but it might be in early September. So what happens? You lose in September and you won't be able to have a chance to recoup because there is no other interregional play.

You might also for example be No. 4 in your region because you lost at No. 3 early in September. Number 3 in your region plays No. 8 in the conference tournament. Number 8 beats No. 3; No. 8 ends up in the regional tournament. There might have been other circumstances, but the idea is that No. 4, because of an early loss, had no way of trying to rectify it.

There's another part of this. I've heard arguments before about teams getting into the tournament because that sport is stronger in their part of the country. In the 1980s, volleyball was strong on the West Coast. All of the national championships were won by West Coast teams. In the 1990s, you've got teams from Texas, Michigan, you've got teams from Nebraska, Florida, who are all vying and competing.

What has happened? You've got to recognize there is more parity now in the country with sports programs than there ever has been before. So take a look and don't just stay with the status quo. Fairness will reign. If you look at basketball—some of you do complain about it—but I'm telling you, it is fair. At least everyone has played a conference schedule. Everyone has had a chance to compete. Your conference is recognized for its conference schedule.

Do you have a surplus of funds? I'm not sure what it is. It could be a million. It could be a million and-a-half. Find a way to put it to use for the student-athlete.

As Lynn Dorn said this morning, "doing the right thing for the right people." I think we need to look at it. Thank you.

Kurt L. Patberg (Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference): I think it's only appropriate to go on record that the commissioners have discussed this issue on numerous occasions and at length. The vote in all of those occasions was almost unanimously in favor of retaining automatic qualification in men's and women's basketball.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you. I think a fair question would be: All in favor of automatic—it's not really automatic qualification, it's probably automatic access—all in favor of automatic access, in sports other than men's and women's basketball, raise your paddles.

I said all in favor of automatic access, in sports other than men's and women's basketball, meaning all the other sports, raise your paddle. All

opposed? Those of you who think it just should remain the status quo? I couldn't really get a feel.

Dennis L. Poppe (NCAA Staff): If I may. I think we have several issues here other than just automatic access. It is semantics, I agree. What automatic qualification is and if you check Bylaw 31, there is a "merit" or, in other words, a "judgment" factor in there. Does the conference merit automatic qualification based upon its performance? Automatic qualification is based upon performance and a "merit" factor.

Automatic access or conference access is a little different. In men's and women's basketball, those two sports committees have opted to provide all conferences access. It's primarily based upon the distribution formula of the enhancement funds. They felt that was an important factor—to make sure that that was distributed to the entire membership. And that has probably overridden the criteria that've been established for automatic qualification.

Without belaboring the issue, automatic qualification really compares all conferences. When you start to compare all conferences, you are doing it on a national level, and that's contrary to regionalization.

What I think Ralph McFillen has suggested, and the committee might consider, is looking at automatic qualification within regions. Then you have the same discussion based upon what Jane is saying: Do you have access or do you have automatic qualification? Do you look at all conferences having the opportunity or do you look at automatic qualification based upon that conference's merit based upon its performance.

It's not an easy yes or no answer. I can understand why there is a lot of head scratching out there about what we are voting on.

Mr. Bryant: Is there any other discussion of access or automatic qualification? Seeing none, let's move on.

Thomas R. Wistrcill (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): Clint, just one second, please. My fellow commissioner, Kurt Patberg, just mentioned something about the commissioner's group. I know one of the frustrations we've talked about as commissioners is that some sports committees are still dominated by coaches. That has caused some confusion. Some discussion happened among some of the conferences that aren't as well represented on some of those committees. I know we are dealing with the situation in our region. We're slowly starting to change from the coaches dominating the committee to the administrators. That seems to help this automatic qualification issue a little bit.

I think the feeling has been that if coaches are dominating the committees, then qualification status sometimes runs into some problems. Maybe that's semantics as well. But slowly, as administrators become more and more involved in the selection process, then the issues hopefully won't be so diverse.

Peter Chapman (Wayne State College, Nebraska): I know there is not a lot of us, but in this discussion about automatic qualifying through access or whatever, there is a small number of independents in Division II. We don't get to play the full conference schedule and our kids don't get to compete in postseason competition at a conference level.

When we schedule we have to schedule around other people in terms of their availability. Conferences are starting to grow. They are having 18 to 20 conference games in basketball. That leaves only six or seven games to schedule, which are all in the first semester. Some schools want to have a lot of home games outside of their conference with NAIA schools and that has added a lot of difficulty. We are independents, not by choice most of the time.

Please consider that when you are talking about qualification and access to national competition.

James P. Jorgenson (Northern California Athletic Conference): Clint, would you rephrase that question to see if there are delegates who would support automatic access based on merit and get a straw vote on that, please?

Mr. Bryant: You heard that. Would you support automatic access based on merit? All in favor, would you please raise your paddle? Automatic access based on merit. Those opposed?

Again, I think what we might get from this discussion and from the input to the Championship Committee is to really look at all the issues as a deal for automatic access and be able to provide the membership some of the questions. From there we need to see if there is a consensus of which way to go.

Okay. Intraregional versus interregional results. It is the current policy of the Division II Championships Committee regarding intraregional and interregional results that in-region results are primary, out-of-region results may be considered if there are common opponents, consistent with the concept of regionalization. Does it hinder or assist governing sports committees in evaluation of teams?

Seeing no one at the microphones, I guess we'll move on.

We'll move to power ratings. Should power ratings for all sports be similar to provide consistency or are there differences from sport to sport that need to be considered when evaluating teams? Can you see the transparency about power ratings? Is there any discussion about power ratings? Can't read it very well? Are people having problems seeing the transparencies? You are.

Mr. Poppe: If you look at your issue statement, the questions are answered after each section. If you can't read it, like Rudy, you can find it here.

Clint, if I may, Jane mentioned this earlier about the development of a consistent evaluation of strength of schedules. We apologize that we are throwing out a lot of terms. There are some semantics differences here and so forth, but those of you who have been on governing sports committees will know the terms we are using. The power ratings have been an attempt by the various sports committees to develop an objective evaluation of the strength of schedule. I mentioned basketball had a ranking. You get so many points for a Division I win, so much for a Division II win, so much for a Division III win and you get some negative points; I'm paraphrasing here. But that's normally what they try to do, assign a point value to your schedule. Therefore, they can develop a 2.5 rating or a 3 rating of an institution's schedule. That's an attempt to objectively determine the strength of schedule. What the committees have found is given different sports, they've gone different ways.

We've found that some sports committees consider losses, some do not. There has been some consistency through the years, but is that alright? Do you think that each sport committee should have that consistency or should they have the autonomy within their sports to develop what they think is applicable to that sport?

Mr. Battle: I have a comment on the power-rating question. Again, it seems to me that it all relates back to the discussion about regional competition. If you are going to do a power rating within a region against those teams that a particular team may compete against, it may prove something. But if you do a power rating and you compare a first-place team because of its power rating in one region, you can't determine whether or not that first-place team is better than a fourth-place team based on a power rating from someplace

else or from another region. It seems to me that that's where the problem is when it comes to the national championship.

So the power rating within the region presents some problems because of the lack of cross-conference competition within the region. So even that would present some problem. But it certainly presents a problem, it seems to me, on a national level because I don't see how if a team competes in a region and you are basing its won-lost record against whomever, it's tough to determine whether or not a first- and a fourth-place team are comparable. It depends on the quality of play of whatever sport across regions.

Herb F. Reinhard (Valdosta State University): In regard to the intra-versus interregional results, many times teams compete outside of their region against national opponents. They're perhaps not rewarded with wins when it comes time for the regional committee to look at won-lost records, but oftentimes they are penalized for "good losses" because they look at won-lost record.

If we're not going to consider wins or going outside of your region to play nationally ranked opponents, then also the losses against those opponents should not negatively affect your won-lost record when that's considered.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you.

Moving right along to Bylaw 31.3.3.4. We've had a lot of discussion at the Championships Committee level about it. Should Bylaw 31.3.3.4 be eliminated? Dennie, would you quickly update everyone on 31.3.3.4?

Mr. Poppe: Very simply, Bylaw 31.3.3.4 says that if a team is selected from your conference, it must be your conference champion.

I'll be very candid with you. I am speaking on behalf of our national office staff. I don't think I've ever seen that help a conference in its application. Its usually becomes a problem when a conference has an upset, for example, in the conference tournament and that is the conference champion. That is the team that you have to pick. Unfortunately, in some championship brackets, we don't have enough berths; there is not the flexibility to take a second team from that conference. Therefore, your best team is probably not going to be selected in that situation because you have opted to apply this bylaw, which means we have to take the conference champion that in this case was determined by a postseason tournament. That's usually the scenario we see.

The concept up-front is to honor the conference champion. But in practice, we've seen that this has come back to haunt more conferences than it has helped. Not to be confused with automatic qualification, it's just that if a team is selected from your conference, then it must be your conference champion. That's the application.

Mr. Bryant: Is there any discussion on Bylaw 31.3.3.4?

Barry Blizzard (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): There is waiver possibility of that rule. I'm interested to know how many conferences normally ask for the waiver. I think that would give an indication of the validity of the bylaw.

Mr. Poppe: Barry, Tom Jacobs, who works with us, said there are really very few that apply that bylaw. It's not being used by a lot of your conferences.

Mr. Blizzard: That could be an indication that it's time for it to go.

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I think it's relatively simple, at least in my view. The conference makes a choice. The members make that choice to be a member of the conference. If they don't wish to

have that particular bylaw apply to them, don't have it apply to them. Simple as that.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I suggest that we keep it. If there is going to be the possibility of automatic qualification within regions, it may be a workable option for a conference that may want to look at it.

Right now, many people don't apply it. I understand that. But I don't believe it's time to get rid of it. It's an option, as the gentleman said. We roll the dice if we elect to apply it. It's our choice and we have to live with the results.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you. Seeing no one else at the microphones, give us an indication, please, with your paddles. Should Bylaw 31.3.3.4 be eliminated? All in favor of elimination of that bylaw, raise your paddle.

All opposed to that elimination, raise your paddle. Thank you. Okay. We're going to get through the next question very quickly so we can move into what I consider some of the hot stuff.

Weekly polls, do polls enhance and promote the sport of...

Carol M. Dunn (California State University, Los Angeles): Excuse me, Clint. I'm sorry, but when we take straw votes, could you give us an assessment of what that vote is?

Mr. Bryant: Okay. The vote on Bylaw 31.3.3.4 looked as if there were more opposed to the elimination of Bylaw 31.3.3.4 than there were for against getting rid of the bylaw, if that makes any sense to you, Carol. We can do this electronically if you prefer that, but I don't think so.

Weekly polls. Do the polls enhance and promote the sport or do they cause confusion in the selection process?

I think this was brought up because of regionalization. If someone is ranked in some national poll and then you don't get selected for championship play, you can have a lot of explaining to do to your fans and to your president about why you were not included. Sometimes the polls are on the national level. In Division II, we are dealing from a regionalization standpoint.

Thomas R. Wistrcill (Rocky Mountain Athletic Conference): Tom Jacobs, I'll direct this toward you. It deals with basketball. The Division II women's basketball coaches now do the national poll, correct?

Thomas A. Jacobs (NCAA Staff): Correct.

Mr. Wistrcill: For men, it is the Division II basketball bulletin and the men's basketball coaches?

Mr. Jacobs: Correct.

Mr. Wistrcill: With the national poll for men, in prior discussions that I had with Gary Rubin from the Division II men's basketball bulletin, he had said he was to going to get a group of Division II coaches—one from each region, one from each conference—to vote on this with him. I've heard from a few other commissioners in one of our meetings in December that that was not occurring, that he was doing the national poll in Division II basketball by himself. If that's the case, then we should take the basketball coaches association name off there. If it's not the case, then I just have bad information.

Mr. Jacobs: To be quite candid, it's not really a concern of the basketball committee because it is an outside organization that is conducting a national poll. As per the policy, if there is an organization outside of the sports committee conducting a poll, then the sports committee is prohibited from conducting a national poll.

But to answer your question, in the case of the Division II NABC men's basketball poll, it is true that Mr. Rubin does have the final say on that poll.

He has a series of consultants. He has somebody set up in each of the eight geographical regions, it's not necessarily a basketball coach, as was originally I think the intent of that, but he does have somebody—whether it be a conference SID or an SID from one of the member institutions—to provide him with updated information on a weekly basis. But then he does, in fact, compile that poll, which plays no part whatsoever in the process for selecting teams to the championship. That poll is simply for publicity reasons.

Mr. Wistrcill: I understand that, Tom, and I think that's good that we did separate it. I'm just wondering if our basketball coaches know that their names are attached to it, but yet they are not necessarily voting on it like the Division I poll or even like the women's poll. I think some women's coaches are actually voting on the poll, but on the men's, that's not occurring?

Mr. Jacobs: That is correct. We've had some discussion about this as well. Probably the best place to have that discussion might be at the NABC convention when we meet with the Division II coaches. Maybe we can clarify some of those procedures.

Mr. Bryant: Let's move along now to common selection criteria. Should sports for men and women be required to have the same selection criteria? For example, men's and women's basketball, men's and women's soccer?

Is there any discussion on that point? Okay, then let's raise our paddles. Would the membership be in support of requiring that men and women have the same selection criteria in like sports? All in favor of that, raise your paddle. All opposed?

It looks as though people were supportive of that. Strongly supportive.

Now, moving to No. 10, the prioritization of selection criteria. Should selection criteria be categorized as primary or secondary or put in any sort of priority order or is this too restrictive for governing sports committees in their ability to consider all factors when selecting teams?

Seeing no one at the microphones, let's move on. The next point that we would like to bring up is issues raised in the application of site determination policies.

The Division II Championships Committee formed a subcommittee chaired by Bill Lide to review these issues. At this time, I would call upon Bill Lide to give us an overview of what his subcommittee did.

William E. Lide (North Carolina Central University): The site selection subcommittee reviewed and reaffirmed the criteria listed in Bylaw 31.

It was agreed that the most controversial of the issues and probably the least understood policy regarding site selection is the concept of geographical proximity. The committee attempted to clarify the policy and reviewed it with the chairs of the various Division II governing sports committees during a September 22 meeting in Kansas City. As you know, at that meeting all of the sports chairs participated. Clint led that one and it was just an outstanding meeting. We were really glad to have that happen.

We certainly talked about the most pressing issue being geographical proximity, but then other issues that were raised involved the 500-mile radius and revenue potential. There were subdivisions of all of those issues that we discussed. In addition, the subcommittee reviewed a directive from the NCAA Presidents Commission that we should review the geographical proximity policy; we should determine how the policy could be communicated to the membership on an annual basis; and we should study the feasibility of establishing predetermined sites for Division II championships.

As noted already, the topic of geographical proximity has been reviewed.

I'm sure we'll receive considerable discussion in this session because it seems to be on the minds of a great number of people. Of course, you have proved us wrong today about that. With regard to communicating to the membership, it was the subcommittee's opinion, which was adopted by the Championships Committee, to clarify and define the terms in the NCAA Manual and championships handbook that describe geographical proximity in order to make it more "user-friendly."

The topic of predetermined sites is still being reviewed. However, it should be noted that currently the baseball, men's and women's basketball, and football finals are at predetermined sites. The women's volleyball championship will be conducted at a predetermined site in 1998.

We should be prepared to discuss those issues. I'm hoping that we can. We're hoping those in the audience and those of our committee members will have a good discussion about that now. I'll turn it back over to Clint.

Mr. Bryant: NCAA Bylaw 31.1.3.2.5 requires that Division II governing sports committees must pair a team strictly within their regions, taking into consideration geographical proximity of teams to one another within their regions. Waivers may be granted to this policy and the Division II Championships Committee has approved waivers for football and men's and women's basketball. Governing sports committees must request a waiver of this policy during one of the regularly scheduled business meetings of the Division II Championships Committee.

Last year in Division II men's basketball, we had a situation involving Fort Hays State University, the No. 1 seed who was not going to get a chance to host because more flights were going to the No. 2 seed. At the urging of the Division II Men's Basketball Committee, the Division II Championships Committee conducted a conference call in late February to review the situation, even though the basketball committee's request was technically out of order.

It was at that time that the Division II Championships Committee ruled that the request was out of order and that any such recommendations for a waiver must be presented during one of the regularly scheduled meetings of the committee.

The men's and women's basketball committee then came back in August and recommended that it be able to go to the No. 1 seed assuming all other hosting requirements were met. The recommendation was tabled pending further study and discussion, which is where we are today.

Edward Hammond (Fort Hays State University): How you doing?

Mr. Bryant: I just knew you'd be here.

Mr. Hammond: I want to talk about baseball first. You have mentioned that the practice has been that geographical proximity would apply there, and then last spring articulated our problem with the basketball situation. Within a few weeks of that, we were in the western region baseball playoffs. One of the three teams in the western region baseball playoffs was a fine team from Chico State that went undefeated and won and the national championship. For us and Mesa, geographical proximity was not applied. If geographical proximity would apply, we would not have been at No. 1 seeded Chico State to play. We would have been at Mesa. I think that's one of the problems that confuses us because at one time geographical proximity applies and one time geographical proximity didn't apply.

But setting all that aside, we've got a problem with geographical proximity as an Association. Chico State really did deserve the right to host that

championship. They were the No. 1 seed. They went on to prove that by winning the national college world series in Division II.

But because California is west, Colorado is in the middle and Kansas is on the eastern side, if we just used geographical proximity, we're always going to play in Colorado or in the center part of the western region and disadvantage the West Coast schools whose players and fans may have earned the right as the No. 1 seed to host the regional tournament.

I think that's what we're talking about. Geographical proximity works to empower one conference or region of the country over others, regardless of skill or ability of the teams.

In basketball, we have three conferences, as you are well aware, and as Mr. Jacobs is well aware, in our region. A north one, a central one, and a south conference. If you are using geographical proximity and saying that it needs to go to the No. 1 or No. 2 seed, it's always going to be hosted by that central conference, which isn't fair or equitable.

It would be my suggestion that we go ahead and bite the bullet and host the regional at the No. 1 seed regardless of geographical proximity. The hand-out says it will cost us about \$66,000. I think I was right that Chico State hosted the west regional basketball tournament. I think it probably was incorrect that Fort Hays was forced to go north to participate in the basketball tournament last year. But we have a vested interest in both those decisions.

K. Dan Summy (University of North Alabama): On behalf of the 16 member schools comprising the Gulf South Conference, I urge the elimination of the geographical proximity rule in the selection of host sites for NCAA post-season competition.

The purpose of this rule was to save money. Yet, according to the NCAA, the actual savings have really been minimal. Over the past five years, these savings have averaged just \$6,000 a year when compared to the total cost of conducting the 24 different championships with a price tag of over \$4.5 million dollars. The savings is quite small indeed.

The real impact of the rule, however, is a decidedly negative one. Teams strive all season long to earn the opportunity to be selected for NCAA post-season play. The best of these schools are also rewarded with the top seeds within their region, prior to the start of many regional tournaments. This seeding is based upon the overall record as well as head-to-head competition against other quality teams in the regional. And yet, the top-seeded team is often not awarded the host site for the NCAA regional tournament. The reason is the geographical location of this institution in relation to the other schools selected for the regional tournament. If at least two other schools are located within 400 miles of each other, then one of them gets to host the event in accordance with the prevailing geographical proximity rule. Thus, the best school as determined by the governing sports committee is often denied the opportunity to host an NCAA postseason event simply because of its campus location. This is wrong.

Coaches and student-athletes who excel should be rewarded accordingly. Those teams who can earn the top seed designation should also earn and receive the opportunity to host a postseason regional tournament event. To deny them this earned honor is unfair and goes against the principles of fair play. Cost savings, which are minimal at best, cannot be used to justify the denial of an earned right. We ask the other Division II member schools to join

us in urging the immediate elimination of geographical proximity as a governing rule in the conduct of the NCAA Division II championship program.

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks): I wish to reiterate the comments made by my good friends at Fort Hays State concerning the use of the proximity rule. The University of Alaska Fairbanks is a member of the Pacific West Conference. As many of you know, it's not uncommon for us to travel 3,000 miles to participate against a conference member—not out of our region, that is our region.

Proximity does not work there. In fact, as I know some of the gentlemen from California are very aware, that proximity actually works toward their benefit. We have never been the host in Anchorage, which has had opportunities in the past, nor have some of our good members in Hawaii. I agree, it's unfair for the minimal amount of savings we're dealing with here that the No. 1 seed can't host. Thank you.

Curtis Dan "Dee" Outlaw (University of West Alabama): I'm a member of the Division II Baseball Committee. I'd like to respond to Bill's comments about geographical proximity being "user-friendly." I've got news for you, Bill, it's not user-friendly. It's hard to deal with. On a national level, it's hard to go back to our constituents in this room and explain to them why their teams did not get to host even though they were the No. 1 seed or possibly the No. 2 seed, and that we've taken the championship to the No. 3 or 4 site.

We urge the Championships Committee to reconsider the geographical proximity rule.

James F. Battle (Virginia Union University): In terms of geographical proximity, it sometimes may be reported as a positive savings for the NCAA in terms of travel, but it might have been a loss to the institution that hosts. Because of geographical proximity, a fourth- or fifth-place team may host, but lose earlier in the tournament. Once that host team is out, nobody comes to the game. But then that host site has to pay the guarantee, so it's negative for the host site even though it is reported as a savings to the NCAA. Where did the savings come from?

Ed B. Harris (West Texas A&M University): Dennie, a few other people got to talk to me about this issue last spring when it related to our women's basketball team. It was ranked No. 1 in the region and in the top 10 in the nation all year. We had to travel because of geographical proximity. Then my women's volleyball team was No. 2 in the region and North Alabama had to come to our house. So, Dennie, I didn't call you about that and complain, did I?

I firmly believe we should go to the site of the No. 1 team. I think we can enhance our sports by doing that because we can then make revenue production a larger part of this. We can cut this \$66,000 average very quickly. As it stands right now, those who are in the center—my friends at the MIAA know how I feel about this—can make a minimum bid and be reasonably sure that they are not going to have to work to market this minimum bid. They'll get it because they are sitting in the center.

But you may have someone on the fringe whose got a 5,000-seat house and the fan support to enhance that sport by putting that bid up. In my years as an athletics director, I've laughed a couple times because of a bid I put in and was told that the winner would get the baseball minimum bid because of location.

Melvin R. Ramey (University of California, Davis): I would like to speak on this issue differently. Everything I've heard so far has left out one factor

that I think is important and that we should all keep in mind. I haven't heard anyone mention the welfare of the student-athlete's academic program as we consider this factor.

This is an issue that as FAR I have been getting letters from other faculty about because of the situation at our university, but I see others have the same concern. You can consider this year's football championship. Northern California universities traveled four consecutive weekends to play. That means that their student-athletes were away from their classrooms every Friday for four consecutive weeks. UC Davis would have had the same situation if we had been successful in the semifinals. Some of the other teams in the playoffs did not travel until the championship game.

I think those students who had to travel and miss four consecutive classes on four separate weeks—in some cases, if you are using a quarter system, that's almost 40 percent of one of your class meetings that you have on a Friday—were put at an academic disadvantage. I think somehow or another the committee should try to work out a way to take into account, especially in the later rounds of the playoffs, the academic welfare of our students, because we do say that this is why we're doing this and we do have to keep them in mind.

I think the students at Northern Colorado both last year and this year were disadvantaged in a way that we can take care of if we put that in as one of the factors. Thank you.

Charles A. "Tod" Eberle (Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania): I'm the chair of Division II Men's Basketball Committee. Another thing that we found out last year when we were getting ready to determine this particular situation was that we just used the 400 miles. We assumed that anybody who was 400 or more miles away was going to fly.

But that's not necessarily the case. Some teams have tough times making flight arrangements from wherever they are. They may decide to bus. If you fly, you have to pay your own ground transportation if you are at the site. So in many instances, we are sitting there making selections on the 400 miles and we're figuring those teams are going to fly when in actuality some of the teams may decide to bus. You never really know what the situation is.

Edward Hammond (Fort Hays State University): I haven't heard anyone who wants proximity. I haven't heard anyone speak for it. I'm still trying to figure out why we're doing this? Where do we go from here, if that's the case?

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): I'm going to take a little different tack with you. As we look at the historical development of the championships themselves, particularly as we now come back into regionalization, we realize that the regionalization part of the championship or the regional championship becomes much more significant now than ever before.

We already have some predetermined national sites. It's really important that the experience the student-athlete has as a result of these championships be first and foremost in our minds as well. We've talked and I've heard all the discussions relative to the competitive advantage of actually hosting a regional competition. I think that from the standpoint of the men's basketball committee, as a member of that committee I personally am supportive of the elimination of geographical proximity.

But as we develop this—and I'm just putting this on the record—I think that the other part that's important is that those institutions that will host

regional competition realize that now only one of those institutions is going on and going to have that national predetermined so-to-speak championship experience in a number of cases. I think it's very, very important that those institutions that will wind up hosting regional competition look at it from the standpoint of wanting to make this the best experience for not only the team that's going to advance, but also the student-athletes who aren't going to advance.

I would just like to make sure that that's fed into the record somewhere because it has been an important aspect of the development of this.

Those of us who have hosted both regional and national competition realize that in the faces of those student-athletes not everyone is going on so let's make this the best experience possible for them.

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): The fallacy of eliminating geographical proximity criteria is the assumption that the No. 1 ranked team is the No. 1 team. You are putting all your eggs in one basket. You are not giving yourself the opportunity to compare facilities and arrangements as far as the student-athlete welfare is concerned.

If the No. 1 team is always going to host, I think that puts a great amount of weight and responsibility on those committees who are ranking the teams because if it's an automatic thing, then it's going to carry much more weight than if it is a judgment made by that committee in evaluating facilities as well as geographical proximity.

I think we ought to exercise some fiscal responsibility in this thing. Just because we have a large amount of money that's come down the pike, all of a sudden we're going to just spend it in any way we want to as opposed to considering what's best for the Association overall?

I'm opposed to eliminating geographical proximity if we would do it for those reasons. Number 1, again, means your No. 1 team is there, regardless. They may not have a good facility. They may not have good hotels. They may not be in a good location for people to be able to get to. I don't think it makes common sense to eliminate geographical proximity.

Barry Blizzard (West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): Clint, I would assume that the other criteria would remain intact and that there still would be a bid process to take care of what Ralph was speaking of, so this would just eliminate one of the criteria. It would not be automatic that the No. 1 team would get the event unless they met the other criteria.

Ed B. Harris (West Texas A&M University): We are talking about eliminating geographical proximity, not eliminating the other issues. The No. 1 seed obviously still has to have the appropriate facility, still has to have the available rooms, the minimum guarantees, revenue potential. I don't think any of us who advocate doing away with geographical proximity are saying give it to us and we'll conduct it in our barn.

Mr. Bryant: Let me share this with you because the committee studied this issue long and hard also. These were the points that we came up with in considering if geographical proximity policies are to be revised or eliminated. The No. 1 issue was if all No. 1 seeded teams were granted postseason opportunities, then the estimated increase in championship transportation costs would be approximately \$66,000 per year based on a study of the previous five championship seasons.

A decision would need to be made as to whether this is a fiscally responsible action or if it is of such concern with membership that it is a necessary expense.

If the No. 1 seeds were automatically given host opportunities, there exists

an opportunity that an institution located a great distance from other institutions might be selected. There are Division II member institutions in both Alaska and Hawaii.

Third bullet—the inability of fans from some of the competing teams to attend the competition if a site is selected that is a considerable distance from the other participating teams.

Four, how accurate is the procedure used by the governing sports committees to determine No. 1 seeds since it is a subjective evaluation process? Does the fact that the No. 1 seed should host override the quality of the facility and other necessary accommodations or a significant difference in revenue potential of one of the other sites under consideration?

Next, would elimination of the geographical proximity policy conflict with Division II principles regarding budgeting, finances or fiscal responsibility and revenue generation?

The final bullet—could a compromise be implemented that would allow governing sports committees to waive geographical proximity once every four years? Those are just some of the issues we as a committee try to deal with in geographical proximity.

At this time, seeing no one at the microphone, I think the issue is very simple. Should geographical proximity be eliminated and only the No. 1 seeded teams host, assuming they meet the other site selection criteria? All in favor of that, please raise your paddle. All opposed, please raise your paddle.

It looks as if a large number of the membership wants geographical proximity to be eliminated. Now let's understand that this would have to be done legislatively.

Mr. Hammond: I understand that it is in the legislation. I also understand there is a waiver policy possible. I would request that it be placed on the agenda of the Management Council. Would that be the right thing rather than dealing with the waiver now? The Championships Committee will be meeting in the next few weeks. Could they consider a waiver for this year until legislation can be implemented?

Mr. Bryant: Yes, that's fine. That would be the proper protocol.

Mr. Hammond: Do we need to take any action to make sure that occurs?

Mr. Bryant: You'll have to go through the sports committee because the sports committee would be the one who recommends that to the Championships Committee.

Mr. Hammond: So this body doesn't have the right to request that item be placed on the agenda?

Mr. Bryant: No, it's not a factual right, but it's a fact of procedure and policy.

Mr. Poppe: You are procedurally correct in that the topic will be brought up. I think the basketball committee has recommended that we look at some criteria. This discussion will give the committee some guidance and it can go from there.

I think the waiver situation question is what kind of waiver do you want? Do you want just automatic qualification for the No. 1 seed? Do you want No. 1 and No. 2 to be considered? As I understand from the consensus, maybe the higher-numbered seed automatically hosts. I think to clean it up would require legislation but maybe to get around it we can modify the waiver provision.

Mr. Hammond: I think you are right. It does need to get cleaned up. I think the waiver that would be requested would be the No. 1 seed if they

meet the other requirements. No one has suggested that the other requirements would be waived, but that the No. 1 seed would host.

Mr. Poppe: I think we have a sense from the membership that we don't need to get hung up in bureaucracy on this one.

Thomas E. Spicer (Fort Hays State University): I have been sitting here concerned about one issue that keeps coming up when we're talking about fiscal responsibility and budgets. I would like the membership to understand—and I take the risk of probably stepping on some toes when I state this—that there have been some championships in which we've been told when we're trying to make travel arrangements to go to some of those championships not to worry about the expense because it's in the budget, even though some of us have been able to show the NCAA that it is more economical to travel in different ways.

I want it posted that we are concerned about the well being of our student-athletes and we are concerned about teaching fair play and reward for hard work. I really don't want a minute piece of the budget to be a direct factor in choosing our championship sites because there are other ways to get around that.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you. That would be so noted.

Greg Warzecka (University of California, Davis): We've addressed the regional ranking situation with site selection. Let me allude to national rankings and site selection. I'm going back to Professor Ramey's comments about the academic concerns.

The football national ranking in Division II in my estimation is only there to determine the site for the semifinal national championship game. I'd like the football committee and the Championships Committee to reconsider the use of that poll to determine that site. After the regional champions are declared, the football committee uses the national ranking and takes the higher seed still left in competition to award a site.

I believe we should end with the regional rankings and then use some other system to decide who hosts that semifinal game. It could be done easily. If one institution is on the road for the first two games and the other institution in the region has hosted the game, it should switch to the institution that has been on the road for two straight weeks. This again addresses Northern Colorado's situation when they were on the road before finals for four weeks in a row. UC Davis would have been caught in the same situation if we had won the semifinal game.

It has a significant impact on the academic preparation of students for finals. I'd like the Championships Committee to reconsider how the site selection is made in the semifinal game. Thank you.

Mr. Bryant: Thank you. Now, very quickly to the issue of the 500-mile radius. Should the 500-mile radius formula be retained or should governing sports committees be permitted to select sites without geographical restrictions?

I think that is kind of self-explanatory. All in favor of retaining the 500-mile radius formula, please raise your paddle. All opposed?

I think everybody is ready to eat. More were in favor of retaining the 500-mile radius.

Revenue potential. Is revenue potential a priority for Division II or does the seeding of teams override the revenue generation capabilities? This is important guys. Is revenue potential a priority for Division II or does the seeding of teams override the revenue generation capabilities?

All in agreement with revenue potential being a priority with Division II, raise your paddles. All opposed to revenue potential being a priority in Division II. Okay, that answers that question. Revenue potential was not a high priority according to the membership. Before I turn it over to Adam Herbert, I would like to say that all the committees involved in the championship process—those people on the advisory committees, national committees, on up to the Championships Committee—are very, very involved in what they do. They are dedicated. They are working hard in what sometimes seems like a thankless job.

We owe credit to you—our membership and our institutional campuses—for giving us the opportunity to serve in this capacity for the membership.

At this time, I'd like to thank you for your time in providing this committee with valuable input regarding these important issues. Thank you.

Mr. Herbert: Thank you very much, Clint. Just a few announcements before we adjourn for lunch. First, the results of the roll-call votes will be available at the interpretations booth just outside this room as you exit.

Second, I just want to remind you once again that the window of reconsideration will be open immediately after lunch. We will begin promptly at 1:30. This will be the last time for any votes to be cast on any legislation.

[A luncheon recess was taken.]

Monday Afternoon, January 12, 1998

The Division II business session was called to order at 1:30 p.m., with Adam W. Herbert, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Herbert: I ask that the business session would please come to order.

As we indicated earlier, I would now like to open up the window of reconsideration. Any delegate who voted on the prevailing side of any legislation considered this morning may now move to reconsideration. This will be the last opportunity for consideration of legislation during this Convention.

Are there any motions for reconsideration? Are there any motions for reconsideration? The chair does not see anyone at any of the microphones. It's the last chance, are there any motions or requests for reconsideration? Hearing none, the window of reconsideration is now closed.

FORUMS

We will proceed to have our next forum discussion on Division II enhancement funds. It's my pleasure to introduce Tony Ceddia, president of Shippensburg University. He also serves as vice-chair of the Division II Presidents Council and as chair of the Division II Budget and Finance Committee. Tony.

BUDGET AND FINANCE

Anthony F. Ceddia (Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania): Thank you very much, Adam.

Ladies and gentlemen, this afternoon we're going to try to again bring you up-to-date, as we did last year during the Division II business session regarding the work of the Budget and Finance Committee in Division II.

The Budget and Finance Committee, as many of you know, reports to the Division II Presidents Council and the Division II Management Council. We will meet as a committee under the new governance structure March 24.

Previously, we were functioning as a temporary Budget and Finance

Committee. We did begin, as you know from last year's Convention, some work on our mission.

The transition Division II Budget and Finance Committee recommended the budgeting principles for the 1997-98 budget and we reviewed the enhancement distribution models that we had solicited your feedback on through the survey some time ago.

The new Budget and Finance Committee will continue to utilize the budget principles and recommendations established by the transition group when it meets in March. Members of the Budget and Finance Committee include for your information Clint Bryant, director of athletics, Augusta State University; Bob Burnett, president, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Jean Cerra, director of athletics at Barry University; Lynn Dorn, director of women's athletics, North Dakota State University; Adam Herbert, president of University of North Florida; Jerry Hughes, director of athletics, Central Missouri State University; Marvalene Hughes, California State University, Stanislaus; and Gladys Styles Johnson, chancellor, University of Nebraska at Kearney.

We're going to show you up on the screens the nine budget principles that the budget and finance transition group adopted and that were affirmed by the Presidents Council. You will see that one through nine states rather specifically some guidelines that the Budget and Finance Committee should use.

Number 1 focuses on championships. There was strong concern about Division II being able under the new structure to control its own destiny in a better way regarding championships. We had some of that discussion prior to lunch.

Also in No. 2 you will see that Division II championships will receive top priority. Number 3, that we will try to generate as much revenue as possible regarding Division II championships, and at the same time be sensitive to cost-containment philosophies and the regionalization concept. Again, that's some of the geographical issue that got discussed earlier.

I call your attention now to item No. 4 of the principles that we would distribute at a minimum \$3 million annually through the current Division II enhancement fund distribution formula or any other formulas that we may adopt. We'll talk a little bit more about that later.

Number 5, the Division II Championships Committee will be responsible for the mechanics of distributing the enhancement fund. Number 6, and we thought this was a very significant one, and the Presidents and the Management Councils have been adamant in their support of it, that at a minimum, 5 percent of the annual Division II allocation and a minimum of 5 percent of any applicable surplus from the previous year will be designated in a Division II membership reserve or hereinafter known as the membership trust account.

We decided on this approach because we thought it would be fiscally prudent to begin banking some reserves so that in the long run as we face challenges in Division II under the new structure, we would have the fiscal integrity and ability to make adjustments from time to time.

Item No. 7, the annual operating surplus will be designated for the Division II membership reserve and/or to supplemental distribution at the year's end.

Number 8, care will be taken to avoid funding special interests or various segments of Division II. Finally, these principles would be reviewed on an annual basis.

I should suggest to you today that this was a matter—the setting of these

principles—that was not taken lightly by the transition Budget and Finance Committee. We had several meetings during the year to hash these out. I'm very, very pleased with the responsible way the members of the committee handled this issue.

Let me review with you now the 1996-97 results on our budget utilization. In the 1996-97 fiscal year, 6.1 million was spent on Division II championships.

Division II championships expenses were up 15 percent from the previous year and \$800,000 over budget. Much of this additional expense was attributed to transportation increases. The transportation costs on average in the industry were up about 20 percent in spite of the good economy that we had. Division II will be responsible for these increased expenses beginning in the 1997-98 academic year. Unallocated dollars will be used to cover excess expenses over budgeted amounts, so when we show you the next set of figures, on the surface, they are going to look very, very good. But I think we need to keep in mind that we are going to have some expenses incurred this year that are not fully documented at this time and will result in some changes in the 1997-98 budget.

You can see from the transparency that the overall operating budget for the Association is \$254,523,000 annually. Half of that goes to Adam's salary and mine.

The Division II allocation, which wouldn't be a bad salary either, is 4.37 percent of the total operating budget or \$11,122,000. This allocation figure is set by Association policy. Our Division II anticipated expenses are projected at \$6,220,000 for costs associated with game expenses, transportation and per diem allowances.

We have a commitment for the enhancement fund of \$3 million. When you take our total Division II expenses at this time as we project them, it's a \$9,220,000 budget. We have excess of allocation over expenses of \$1.9 million, but remember that 5 percent allocation to the membership trust, which leaves us a projected unallocated figure of \$1,346,000.

As I said earlier, these figures as projections look pretty good. But remember, last year we were \$800,000 over in the championship account alone, so we're going to put that \$1.3 million in the reserve fund to offset any additional expenses we have this year.

Again, keep in mind we get 4.3 percent of the total operating budget and 5 percent of the allocation must be put in the membership trust fund. Now we are totally responsible for funding all of our costs, especially championships. We've done a preliminary analysis of 1998-99. I won't dwell on these figures, but you can see we've prudently tried to project our expenses so that we would wind up again with unallocated funds at the end of the year, which as this year, would be put in the reserve to take care of any unexpected or even expected cost overruns.

That's an overview of our budget. Let me conclude this section by saying we are in total control of our own fiscal integrity at this point. Under the old structure, we would go back to the budget committee, which was a subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the Association, make a case and try to get additional allocations to support championships and other expenses. That avenue is not open to us any longer. One of the prices we're going to pay for in this restructuring is that we must, and I will repeat, we must handle our finances appropriately.

One of the big issues that we talked with you last year—and you were very cooperative in responding to the survey that we indicated we were going

to send you at the business session last year—was that you provided us as a committee with a lot of good feedback on the distribution issue. We wound up with a number of very, very good suggestions. I'll just review them quickly for you and then tell you where the Budget and Finance Committee is at this time regarding this matter. Then we would welcome a discussion or a dialogue on this matter. If you have any thoughts after the conclusion of the Convention, the committee would welcome any correspondence or recommendations from you as well.

First of all, one of the models we looked at was equal distribution of the men's basketball championship. This model is what we currently use. Last year, each Division II institution received approximately \$6,400. Each basketball unit was worth approximately \$1,300. The distribution for each institution would be, if we continued this model, approximately \$5,100 when provisional members become active members under the current funding level.

The second model involved equal distribution, the number of sports sponsored and conference membership. This was suggested by the Division II Commissioner's Association. One-half of the fund would continue to be distributed equally among all Division II members. The other half of the fund would be distributed based upon a formula that awards points for conference membership and sports sponsorship. This model also would reward conferences that have an equal number of men's and women's sports. With the third alternative, sports sponsorships, the entire fund would be divided among member institutions based upon the total number of sports sponsored by that institution. Only sports in which the NCAA conducts championship competition and emerging sports for women would be counted.

The fourth model is based on equal distribution of the entire enhancement fund. Currently, \$3 million would be distributed equally among all Division II member institutions that are active and eligible for NCAA championships.

Another alternative on equal distribution was our fifth model with sports sponsorship as a variable. One-half of the fund would be distributed equally among all Division II member institutions. The other half of the fund would be distributed based on the number of sports sponsored above the minimum requirement for Division II membership. An institution would receive one unit for each sport sponsored beginning with the ninth sport. Only sports in which the NCAA conducts championship competition and emerging sports for women would be counted.

The sixth model is based on equal distribution in men's and women's basketball. This alternative would distribute one-half of the fund equally among Division II institutions. The other half of the fund would be distributed based upon the members' participation in both the Division II men's and women's basketball championship in accordance with the current procedures using a six-year rolling period.

The transition Budget and Finance Committee took seriously all of these alternatives. We spent a number of hours at several different airport locations around the country where we came to meet to discuss these alternatives. The following recommendation was made by the Division II Budget and Finance Subcommittee that acted as a transition group and met during the structural changes I mentioned. This recommendation, along with comments of the Division II membership, will be reviewed by the Budget and Finance Committee when it meets for the first time in March.

The Division II Budget and Finance Subcommittee recommendation is as follows: "Effective with the 1999-2000 academic year, one-half of the enhance-

ment fund be distributed equally to each active institution in good standing, and that the other one-half of the fund be distributed to the Division II conferences based on the number of active member institutions in good standing in each conference. The amount of each institution's distribution will be times the number of members in the conference."

This was recommended to be effective with the 1999-2000 academic year so that conferences had time to prepare for any funding differences that may occur. The Budget and Finance Subcommittee thought it was important to maintain a distribution to conferences because conferences rely on some of the funding for office operations.

The Division II subcommittee noted that while the results of the Division II membership survey did not show overwhelming support for any of the alternatives we discussed earlier, the option for equal distribution of the enhancement fund received the most support. Equal distribution in the committee's view is a more fair method of distribution than the current model. It's important to keep one-half of the distribution for conferences and one-half of the distribution for institutions.

I understand and I can appreciate that there would be differing views on the committee's recommendation. Again, the new Budget Committee, which officially will begin its work at the March meeting, will consider the transition Budget Committee's recommendation.

Now we would be happy and willing to listen to any comments from the membership regarding the direction the Budget and Finance Committee should take regarding the enhancement funds. Thank you for your attention. The microphones are now open for anyone who has any comments.

Timothy J. Dillon (University of Alaska Anchorage): Having served on that budget and finance transition team, there was one little piece that I wanted to make sure that everyone understood and that it was clear.

From the independent standpoint, because half of the moneys were going to conferences, if you were not a member of a conference, you would receive that second share. I think that needs to be clarified so that the independents realized that they weren't going to be left out.

Mr. Ceddia: Thanks Tim, that's correct. Any other comments?

Thank you very much for your attention. I remind you that we would be willing to receive any correspondence, ideas or suggestions from the membership regarding the future work of the Budget and Finance Committee.

AGE-BASED PARTICIPATION

Mr. Herbert: Thank you very much, Tony. Now we want to focus the attention of the membership on Proposal No. 150. I'd like to ask the chair of that project team, Kent Wyatt, if he will come forward. Kent is president of Delta State University. He's a former member of the Presidents Commission and the Division II Steering Committee.

We're moving so quickly, that we're missing a couple things. Pardon us one minute...

Kent Wyatt (Delta State University): We have one staff member who is going to provide some overlays and some good information that's not here yet, but I will go ahead with my remarks and then we will open it up for questions and answers.

The Division II Proposal No. 150 project team was established as a result of the adoption at the 1997 Convention of Proposal No. 150. The proposal directed that a project team be appointed to study whether Division II should

adopt any sort of age-based participation legislation. By age-based participation legislation, I'm referring to legislation that would restrict in some way the participation of older student-athletes in Division II.

Division I currently has such a rule. For students over the age of 21 who have not enrolled in college and who have been participating in outside competition, they are charged with a season of competition for each year of outside participation after the age of 21. The project team's task was to study this issue for Division II and to make a recommendation to the Division II Management Council and the Presidents Council. The committee had representation from the Presidents Council, the Management Council, student-athletes and coaches.

At this time, I would like to introduce the committee members and ask that they stand and remain standing until they've all been presented. First, president Tony Ceddia from Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania, Tony Carol Dunn, California State University, Los Angeles; Doug Echols, South Atlantic Conference; Tara Fontana, California State University, San Bernardino. Tara is a student-athlete on the committee and her sport is soccer. Alfreeda Goff from Virginia State University; President Marvalene Hughes, California State University, Stanislaus; Pat Merrier, University of Minnesota, Duluth; President Allen Sessoms, Queens College; and Sue Williams, University of California, Davis, cross country coach. Thank you, committee.

From the time of its first meeting, the project team noted the importance of assessing the demographics of the student-athlete population in Division II in order to better understand whether significantly more experienced and more mature student-athletes actually are competing in Division II, and to determine just how significant an issue this is in Division II. The project team also noted the importance of trying to find some way to determine the number of student-athletes who might be affected by the adoption of legislation to restrict participation by older student-athletes.

The project team originally reviewed data related to the ages of Division II student-athletes, collected as part of the 1996 NCAA study of drug use and abuse patterns of student-athletes. The project team agreed that the data was of some help; however, we noted that information more specific to the issues to be addressed should be gathered.

The project team considered sending a survey to a random sample of Division II institutions in order to gather information on the student and student-athlete populations on their campuses. In the interest of trying to avoid sending another survey to the Division II membership and also because of the concern about the accuracy of the results that might be obtained from such a survey, the NCAA research staff suggested that the project team review data related to the age of Division II student-athletes by sport as well as the number of foreign student-athletes by sport that were compiled from the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse database.

After reviewing information from the clearinghouse database for Division I and II participants in 1994, '95 and '96 as well as the demographic breakdown of student-athletes at Division II institutions who were among the top finishers in NCAA championship in 1996 and '97, we noted that the percentages of Division II first-time participants over the age of 21 actually are relatively small, and that the age distribution within the group of foreign student-athletes is not significantly different from the age distribution within the group of domestic athletes.

At this time, I would like to introduce, Todd Petr of the NCAA research staff. He's the senior assistant research director who will present in summary form the results from the clearinghouse database that the project team reviewed, Todd.

Todd Petr (NCAA Staff): You got to me a little earlier than I expected. I just want to go over briefly the broad, general data that we looked at in reviewing the issue. I believe there is a packet of information you have that is basically the slides I'm going to show.

First, I want to briefly go over the methods that we used to look at the issue. As President Wyatt stated, the data were taken from the NCAA clearinghouse database. These data are a census of all student-athletes who want to enter Division I or II institutions. We then were able to look at the whole population of potential student-athletes, compare Division I numbers to Division II numbers and take a look at the issue without burdening your institution with another survey. The data that were looked at by the project team included data from 1994, '95 and '96—the three years of clearinghouse data that were available at the time we were doing the study.

Only those student-athletes who appear on final-request lists from a Division I or II institution were included in this study. We took this as the closest proximation that we have to the population of students who end up on campus at either a Division I or a Division II institution. All of these student-athletes are supposed to appear on only one final request list, so we could categorize by Division I or II, depending upon where they appear.

As you see, the ages of student-athletes were calculated as of September 1 of the year that they enter college. So for anybody in the 1994 clearinghouse database, September 1, 1994, was the date from which we calculated their age.

Top teams were selected from the group of institutions in the sports that we took a look at. Generally, the four semifinalists were taken in individual sports and we took the top four teams finishing in sports like cross country, track and field or swimming. We looked at 1996 teams that had competed at the highest levels and compared those groups of institutions and those student-athletes on those teams to the rest of the population of student-athletes, because there was some thought that perhaps the teams succeeding the most had students who were older.

The total end for this group—Division I and II together—across the three years was about 180,000 student-athletes, so we had a lot of data to look at. The chart shows distribution of the ages that we see of entering Division II student-athletes. As President Wyatt noted, we see the vast majority are 18- or 19-year olds, a few 20-year olds. There are very few individuals in the over-20 sample. I think the project team came to the conclusion that a rule limiting the number of seasons of competition for 21-year olds and older wouldn't affect very many people.

When you look at the average age and compare Division I to Division II, this sort of analysis was important simply because Division I does have the age rule in place, and we wanted to see if there was a drastic difference with the group that does have the rule against the group that doesn't. As you can see, there is basically no difference at all. It's in the second decimal place, if there is at all. In terms of average, we don't see that.

The project team also had frequency distribution data for every age for Division I and II, so we're able to compare it in that way as well. The frequency distributions as well as the averages looked very, very similar.

When we took a look at the data from those top teams, for the schools that appeared as championships semifinalists or finalists in 1996 Division II competition, there was a bit larger difference than when we looked across the division but not much difference, in the average age of those teams that were competing at the highest level of athletics success versus the rest of Division II as a whole, so that analysis again didn't seem to indicate that regulation would change things much in that sense.

Finally, the project team wanted to take a look at the average age of international student-athletes. It was thought that perhaps international student-athletes were older. Although this study was not directly in the project's teams charge, there was a peripheral issue that it wanted to look at. As you see, the age of the international students is a bit older than the average student, but they don't exceed that 21-year-old threshold or don't even come close to it. You can see also the proportions of the percentages of foreign student-athletes in Division I and Division II. There is a much higher proportion in Division I and it just hovers around 2 percent for the Division II schools. This may mix other data that we have from other surveys that we've done about foreign students and the proportions in each sport.

What you have in the packet also breaks out the issue of the top teams and the international students on a sport-by-sport basis, which some people thought was important, but there might be differences among sports. As you see there are, in fact, differences among the different sports. I'm not going to pull that up right now, but we thought it would be useful information for you to have in reviewing the issue.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you, Todd. Based on our review of the data, the project team recommended to the Division II Management Council and then to the Presidents Council that they not support the development of age-based legislation to address this specific issue within Division II.

The Management Council and the Presidents Council agreed with these recommendations. The project team noted, however, that there are two additional issues that seem to be of interest to the Division II membership that may deserve further study.

First, the project team recommended that the issue of the amount of scholarship aid provided to international versus domestic student-athletes within Division II be reviewed. In addition, the project team recommended that the issue of the amateur status of Division II student-athletes, particularly international student-athletes, should receive further consideration.

These are issues that appear to be critical to the Division II membership and therefore deserve further study. I am very pleased to tell you that the committee was ably assisted by the staff. We were pleased that Nancy Mitchell, the chief of staff of Division II, and Mike Racy, the assistant chief of staff, were assigned to us and they certainly kept us on target.

Now, the committee and the staff would be pleased to respond to any questions that you might have or to discuss any issues.

Joseph T. Donahue (California State University, Stanislaus): We are looking for a clarification. I'm looking at table six that has the average age of foreign student-athletes. I'm also looking at your methods page that says that data were taken from the eligibility clearinghouse database for the '94, '95 and '96 entering freshmen. How are transfer students handled? Is that what the next bullet lists or is this data of only freshman student-athletes from those cohorts?

Mr. Petr: These are just the entering freshman student-athletes.

Mr. Donahue: So all foreign students who were transfers are not in this data?

Mr. Petr: I don't believe they are, no.

Mr. Donahue: I think that's a pretty significant question. We have a very limited number of foreign student-athletes, but I would say most of them are transfers as opposed to freshman, so I would find that very interesting to add the foreign transfer numbers and then see how the information stacks up the next time that this study is undertaken.

Mr. Petr: Okay. I'm not familiar with how transfers are handled in the clearinghouse, but it's something that's certainly welcome.

Mr. Donahue: Thank you.

Sarah Preston (University of Missouri, Rolla): I'm a member of the track and field committee. Our committee does have some concerns on this issue. I would like to share some of those concerns. The sports of cross country and track and field have experienced an increase in the number of older international athletes since Division I adopted its policy concerning participation after the 21st birthday.

The results of the recent cross country championships reflect a dramatic impact in this area. In the women's race, there were a small number of international participants—five or six, we took a hand count so I'm not exactly sure. The top-three finishers in the race were international participants with a fourth in the top 10. The individual women's champion was in her early 30s. In the men's race, we had approximately 22 international participants out of 132, that's around 16 to 17 percent. The top-five finishers were international participants and 10 of the top 25 were international student-athletes. The majority of them would be affected by the 21st-birthday legislation. We feel that is much of the reason that we're seeing them in Division II now.

Research has proven the peak age for a distance runner is in the late 20s, and these physiologically mature runners, and in most instances, internationally experienced competitors, have a distinct advantage over the entering students, which the project team found to be about 18.65 on the men's side and 18.47 on the women's side.

Therefore, we would like to see further study on the impact of the international competitor in direct reference to the outcome of the championships, particularly in the championship in which we work. We also support further study of the project team recommendations on the amounts of scholarship aid provided to international versus domestic student-athletes.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you. You are speaking primarily to the foreign athlete. We were specifically charged with not to just look at the foreign athlete, but to look at the total package, domestic and foreign. We did recommend they do further study in that area. I'm sure they will.

Ms. Preston: We are very supportive of that.

Anthony Capon (University of Pittsburgh, Johnstown): I commend the committee for the work it did on this. I do want to comment on the comments that were just made.

Looking at average ages can obscure the effect of a relatively few number of highly qualified athletes. As a simple example, if you have a track and field program that has 40 student-athletes with an average age of, for example, 20 and you add to that program two student-athletes who are 25 years old, you will increase the average age of that squad by less than a quarter of a year, which would be an insignificant amount. However, if those two stu-

dent-athletes are both highly qualified and experienced on the international level and are capable perhaps of placing in two or three national events, the impact of those two students will be in great disproportion to the number of international or the number of older student-athletes you have.

The question, it seems to me, is not how many older student-athletes we have in Division II, but what their impact is. Division I doesn't have this problem because Division I makes an assumption that competition after a particular age gives you a competitive advantage over the younger athlete.

When the committee recommends that we look at the amateur status of these athletes, I think that's a very good idea, but you can have a 25-, 26-, 27-, 28-year-old student-athlete who has been competing on the international level for seven or eight years who is nevertheless an amateur.

What we're looking at is whether or not there is a level playing field for these athletes, that's the first comment. The second comment I'd like to make, although you did not specifically discuss the items in table four and table six, a quick perusal of those tables indicates that the sports in which the greatest difference in age in Division II between the top teams and the other teams, are men's ice hockey, men's soccer and men's tennis. They are also the sports that you show on the subsequent page that have the highest proportion of foreign athletes participating. So there is some relationship there that I think has to be looked at.

Mr. Wyatt: Thank you. We did look at all of that very closely. When we looked at the number of the top-team finishers and the few of those who were 21 and older when they entered school, we didn't feel that that was significant enough to eliminate 21-and-older from participating in our other sports programs throughout Division II. That was one of our reasons.

Would anyone else on the committee like to speak to that? If not, are there any other questions or discussion items? Since I see no one at the microphone, Mr. Chairman, I'll turn it back over to you.

ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Herbert: Thank you very much, Kent, and to each of the members of this project team, I want to express our appreciation for the excellent job that you've done.

With regard to some of the questions that have been raised, we have broken this issue up into two parts for follow-up with regard to foreign athletes. We have one subcommittee that's looking at financial aid for foreign athletes and that has been assigned to a subcommittee of that group chaired by Leon Kerry. The amateur status of foreign athletes also has been assigned to a committee that is headed up by Bob Brennan. We'll ask that they collaborate with Division I because there is obviously some important linkages there that we want to assure are addressed.

Now, let me ask Mary Lisko if she would please come forward to give a report of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee. Mary is faculty athletics representative of Augusta State University and also is chair of the Division II Academic Requirements Committee.

Mary Lisko (Augusta State University): Good afternoon, we're delighted to be with you. Let me introduce my colleagues. Along with me today I have Pam Gill-Fisher. Pam is the associate director of athletics at the University of California, Davis. We all heard her wonderful comments in her role as the senior woman administrator at the athletics administrator's conference. The third presenter today is Diane Husic. Diane is a faculty rep at

East Stroudsburg University. She's an associate professor in the chemistry department and several of us had the good fortune of hearing her on Friday as vice-president of Division II at the FARA meeting.

I've always heard that in a presentation, it is our job to talk and it's your job to listen. Ideally, we'll do what we're supposed to do and hope that you don't finish before we do.

This afternoon, we're going to let you know more about the critical issues of initial eligibility. I'm going to highlight for you some of the significant legislation that the NCAA has passed that helped create our present Division II position on initial eligibility. Pam will next detail for you the topics of the core-course review and general initial-eligibility procedures. Last, but not least, Diane will review for you a pending change to the 48-H renewal process that will strengthen the dialogue that we have begun between high schools and the NCAA to provide for timely certification decisions on the part of our student-athletes.

Think back if you will, think back a ways. Some time ago, an American foundation published a study on intercollegiate athletics, which concluded that recruiting had become corrupt, professionals had replaced amateurs, education was being neglected and commercialism reigned. The year, 1929. The foundation, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. As Cedric Dempsey told us yesterday in his keynote address, public criticism of intercollegiate athletics is not a new phenomenon.

Fast forward now for more than 50 years to 1983. Stunned by considerable public criticism about the abysmal graduation rates of many of our student-athletes, the NCAA passed Proposition 48. "Prop 48," as it was commonly known, set in place some minimal requirements on high-school athletes in order to participate athletically during their first year of college enrollment. We need to remember that this did not specify high-school graduation requirements nor did it specify collegiate-admission requirements.

It did, however, tie the two together. And if we were to require so much of our student-athletes, they needed to have some basic minimal academic preparation. Specifically, Prop 48 established a floor on the standardized test of 700 on the SAT or comparable scores on the ACT, and a minimum GPA of 2.0 with 11 core academic courses taken in high school. These measures were set in place after a thorough review of the data that suggested that these particular standards would significantly increase academic preparation on the part of our high-school graduates and increase our graduation rates at the collegiate level.

Proposition 48 was just the beginning of a series of additional NCAA legislative reform that was designed to emphasize the word "student" in student-athlete and to enhance their welfare. Despite our cautious optimism that Prop 48 would solve many of the academic issues associated with intercollegiate athletics, academic improvements did not come quickly. Throughout the '80s, intercollegiate athletics remained very susceptible to a broad variety of scandals and impropriety.

During the '80s, 109 colleges and universities were censured, sanctioned or put on probation by the NCAA. That number included more than half the universities playing at the top competitive level. A survey showed that among 100 "big-time" schools, 35 had graduation rates under 20 percent for their basketball and 14 had the same low rate for their football players. Although many of the difficulties were centered on a rather limited number of big-time

athletics programs, all educational institutions were tainted by this public perception of collegiate sports.

In 1989, a Louis Harris poll showed that eight out of 10 Americans questioned agreed that intercollegiate athletics was out of control, and that the many cases of serious rules violations had undermined the traditional roll that universities played as places where young people learned ethics and integrity.

In 1989, therefore, another major reform initiative was begun. This time, the Knight Foundation, a private foundation that focuses on higher education as one of its primary goals, became involved. The Knight Foundation created a commission on intercollegiate athletics, funded it with a \$2 million budget and gave it a two-year timetable. The challenge that this group faced was to develop and help win acceptance of realistic reforms that would allow colleges and universities to successfully operate athletics programs without sacrificing either their ethical standards or their academic integrity.

Over a period of the next year, the Knight Foundation studied, surveyed, questioned and discussed athletics issues with well over 80 experts. Included in their many public meetings were professionals in the areas of athletics administration, coaches, student-athletes, scholars, leaders of professional leagues, representatives from the NCAA and so on.

From these discussions came a governance model and several recommendations that address the issues of academic integrity, financial integrity and independent certification. One recommendation on academic integrity specifically addressed the issue of initial eligibility. Others dealt with continued eligibility and graduation rates.

On the topic of initial eligibility, the Knight Foundation said cutting academic corners in order to admit student-athletes will not be tolerated. Student-athletes will not be admitted unless they are likely to graduate. We now have not only the responsibility as we had before, but a strong public mandate to make sure that we had adequate preparation for admitting our student-athletes.

In the early '90s, the NCAA approached initial eligibility with even greater concerns. After considering the fact that during the four years of high school a student is quite likely to be able to enroll in over 24 courses, the NCAA strengthened its minimum requirements.

The 1992 Convention passed Proposition 16, which increased the number of required core courses from 11 to 13. This is still slightly more than half of what the student potentially will take at the high-school level, leaving the several elective slots available for students to take many, many of the wonderful electives their high schools are offering.

Divisions I and II implemented different versions of this legislation. In Division I, Proposition 16 had companion legislation that created a sliding scale whereby the SAT requirements increased to 900 if the prospective student-athlete had a minimum grade-point average of only 2.0, but remained at 700 if the student-athlete had a 2.5 grade-point average. We in Division II chose not to do this. We agreed to increase our minimum standards from 11 to 13 core academic courses, but chose not to increase our SAT score and not to implement the sliding scale.

Instead, our SAT score remained at 700. One year later in 1993, Division I passed legislation requiring four years worth of English and two years worth of math designated primarily as algebra and geometry. We again in Division II chose not to follow their lead and stay with our previous require-

ments, which are specified in our Manual in Bylaw 14.3.1.2. The requirements are three years worth of English; two years worth of math; two years of natural or physical science, including at least one lab science; two years of additional English, math, or science courses; two years worth of social science; and two years of additional core courses including any of the above courses or foreign languages, computer science, philosophy or nondoctrinal religion.

In the Manual, Bylaw 14.3.1.3 gives some further details and definitions to each of these core areas. In addition, we've retained a minimum score of 700 on the SAT, which has since been "recentered" to an 820. The NCAA eligibility requirements will allow a student to use the highest verbal and the highest math score that he or she receives, based on multiple administrations of that particular exam.

Overall, there is very strong evidence that the initial-eligibility requirements are leading to better-prepared students. Graduation rates have increased significantly since the implementation of the increased academic standards. During the past five years, athletes have been graduating at higher rates than the remaining full-time student body. The clearinghouse, which monitors the high-school records for more than 150,000 potential student-athletes each year, has evidence that on the average, high-school students are earning well in excess of the 13 minimum core courses required for athletics participation during their first year of college enrollment.

At last count, the average number of courses taken by students at the high-school level was in excess of 17. I would remind you also that there is a waiver process in place for students who do not meet initial-eligibility requirements for whatever reason. So student-athletes do have some relief if for some reason their high school did not offer the courses or if for some reason they were unable to successfully complete the courses.

What's the future going to hold for us? The NCAA has many allies in its quest for greater academic preparation on the part of high-school students. Among the strongest supporters are its own member institutions—you and I and those of us in this room. Throughout the country, many colleges and universities have been implementing higher expectations of their entering freshman classes.

State taxpayers of state legislatures have been questioning the need to teach remedial classes at the university level. Universities are getting out of the remedial business and turning this function where it's necessary—back to the community colleges.

A second note of optimism comes from the fact that a large number of states are also increasing their own expectations and requirements for high-school graduates. My own state of Georgia recently increased the number of units required for graduation and will begin requiring four years worth of English and four years worth of math, including algebra I, geometry and algebra II for those students who indicated they are planning to go to college. Many other states are also raising the bar for high-school graduation.

The high-school community itself is very concerned about turning out students who have a higher level of achievement. Over the past two years, the NCAA has invited participation by many representatives of the high-school community in discussions over our initial-eligibility standards and of our core courses. These discussions have been very fruitful and stimulating. You will hear more about some of this initiatives from both Pam and Diane.

A final stimulus to improve high-school achievement has been the busi-

ness community. Although students who immediately enter the work force are not the focus of NCAA efforts, complaints by the business community that it is required to spend millions of dollars each year teaching basic reading, writing and math to entry-level employees, all of whom have earned high-school diplomas, have not fallen on deaf ears. Elementary and secondary school administrators and state and local boards of education have formed partnerships with many major corporations to improve the quality of the school systems in their areas. Many individual schools and school systems are now the beneficiaries of both the financial resources and the personnel provided by their corporate partners.

As the schools improve, all students will benefit. One of the initiatives this year that has recently helped resolve many of the initial-eligibility issues has been the formation of ad hoc core-course committees. We did vote this morning to make sure that those committees will become standing committees of the NCAA. Members of the committee have included members of our institutions of both Divisions I and II and the high-school disciplinary groups. Pam has been a member of one of these group as has Diane. Pam will now let you know more about their operation this past year as well as some additional topics that relate to initial eligibility. Pam.

Pamela L. Gill-Fisher (University of California, Davis): Before I begin, I think we should feel very confident in the leadership that Division II has been provided through Mary's expertise and hard work. I was on the Academic Requirements Committee when it was one Association-wide committee. Now, having been on that committee that is now a Division II committee, I have to tell you that I think that Division II is very fortunate to have Mary leading this group.

Mary not only serves as chair of the Academic Requirements Committee, she serves on the Initial-Eligibility Waiver Committee, the Core-Course Review Committee and the NCAA clearinghouse committee. Based on her comments, I can tell you that she has great expertise. It's a real privilege to be able to work with her. I think Division II is in good hands in this area.

To go on from there, I've been asked to talk about the previous process in reviewing core courses and the process for a course to become certified. I'm going to try to give some background so that when Diane comes up, you'll have some idea of where we have come from and why we're going to a new system.

As Mary indicated, we right now have five core-course review committees. Those committees were composed of faculty members from Division I and Division II campuses. In addition, we invited input from each of the national high school associations in those disciplines. In fact, those people have been involved in the past year and have been very helpful in the review of those courses. Each of the core-course review committees in each of the disciplines this past year has developed a check sheet that was used in reviewing courses that may have been denied or in courses that were questioned by the clearinghouse.

Those check sheets included questions about course content, percent of information of a particular discipline, the textbook that was used and how the course fit in the total curriculum. Each discipline was basically developing its own system, but many of the questions were the same. When you looked at the check sheet, the only differences came from the particular disciplines uniqueness.

Now you are familiar with the core-course review committees and how

they were composed. Let me begin my next remarks by explaining the core-course review process used by the clearinghouse.

As I was asked to make this presentation, I thought the best way to find out if I really understand something is to actually explain it to someone else to see if they understand it. I've gone over this with our faculty athletics representative. The first time I went through it, he was totally confused. I hope I don't do the same for you. After having practiced it, I think we at least understand. I hope you will also when I'm finished.

The core-course review process begins with the high schools. I've been told that not everyone was familiar with the fact that every high school, which includes about 18,000 high schools in the country, was asked to begin submitting a form called the 48-H Form. This form was to include all courses that the high school felt met the requirements of Bylaw 14.3.1.1 that Mary referenced before.

The clearinghouse received that form with the submitted course listed, and based on the criteria in 14.3.1.1, the clearinghouse determined that the course was approved and met the criteria or was denied and did not meet the criteria based on obvious noncompliance with the subject matter and the description of what was required. An example would be firefighting as a core English course or courses questioned by the clearinghouse as to whether or not they actually fit the requirements.

If the course was denied, it was sent back with courses that were approved to the high schools with an explanation of an appeal process for any course that the high school felt was inappropriately denied. If they decided to appeal the course, they are required to submit additional information, including the previously described check sheet. That information was then sent to the NCAA staff, which could make an obvious decision if the course was possibly misrepresented by the title, which is all the clearinghouse would have originally had based on basic information.

The first step in terms of the appeal process would be through the NCAA staff. If the staff determined that the course could not obviously be approved, the course would be forwarded to the Core-Course Review Committee in the discipline that the high school was requesting it be counted. The review committee would review the materials, could ask for additional materials if the materials provided were not adequate, and then make a decision as to whether or not the course should be approved.

Courses that were questioned originally by the clearinghouse would follow the same process, only they did not have to come back from the high school. The questioned courses would have been sent immediately to the NCAA staff where they could have been forwarded to the Core-Course Review Committee for a final decision. Once the Core-Course Review Committee had made the final decision, the information was sent back through the NCAA staff to the clearinghouse and the high school.

So in summary, a course could be immediately approved by the clearinghouse, it would be denied or it would be questioned. On questioned or denied courses, the appeal process would kick in. This past year, the Core-Course Review Committees reviewed approximately 7,000 courses that were denied or appealed by the high school. It's very important to emphasize that throughout this process the courses were not tied to the eligibility of a particular student-athlete. If a student-athlete was not certified because he lacked a core course, the student could appeal to the Initial-Eligibility Waiver Committee for certification based on his overall academic record.

In looking at the process as it currently stands, there was concern over student-athletes and courses being tied together because the high schools throughout this process, even after they had initially submitted the 48-H, could add courses that were not certified.

At this point, I will move to Diane, who will talk about the proposed system for core-course review. Thank you.

Diane Husic (East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania): What you've heard to this point is what the situation has been. From a lot of people's perspective this has worked fairly well. However, due to persistent criticism of this system, for reasons I'll outline in just a moment, the Division II Presidents Council earlier this year requested a review of the entire eligibility process.

About this same time, there was a total reorganization of the NCAA membership services staff to form a comprehensive academic team. This was published in *The NCAA News* and you may have seen this. This team includes many staff members who bring expertise and experience in a variety of areas related to academic issues. The reorganization was also intended to direct more resources to initial eligibility during peak periods of the year.

At the beginning of the review process, the people who were involved in the discussion identified the core-course review issue as one of the most critical areas in which criticisms had been received, so that was our starting point in terms of the review.

One of the biggest criticisms from this group was that the review of core courses had placed a large burden on the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse and moved it away from its original intent. The expenditure in terms of time and staffing expense had become extreme. There has also been extreme criticism from the public about the role of the NCAA in terms of evaluating high-school courses. This criticism has distracted from the value of your initial-eligibility standards and the academic reform movement that Mary mentioned.

Thirdly, there is a vast number of high-school courses that are offered nationwide. Pam mentioned the fact that this subcommittee has reviewed 7,000—those are only the ones that were questioned. There are thousands and thousands of courses in this country, curricula change and it was basically impossible to truly evaluate core courses thoroughly. On top of this, the curricula and the instructional methods are constantly evolving, so what a high school puts on a 48-H Form might be fine for one year, but there are trends that change very rapidly in all education. Those change sometimes on a yearly basis, sometimes not quite that quick.

In contrast, NCAA legislation is really based on the notion of traditional academic disciplines. Finally, one of the other major criticisms is that high-school administrators strongly objected to the role the NCAA played in the evaluation of core courses. These administrators felt that they could best make some decisions in terms of the content and the quality of the courses that they offered at their own schools.

From the onset of the review process, we felt it was incredibly important to involve on a more significant basis the high-school community. I'll come back to that in a second, but I want to point out to you the extensive participation in this review process by a variety of interested parties to date.

First of all, there were several members of committees both in the Division I academic cabinet and subcommittee on initial eligibility. The Division II Academic Requirements Committee members were involved. Members of these core-course review subcommittees worked very closely with the NCAA

Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse Committee. The NCAA staff has provided numerous people, time and research information for this review process.

Finally, and most importantly in terms of some of the criticism that has been prominent throughout the last few years, there is a wide variety of representation from the secondary school community. Officially, there are five national organizations represented at the table in our discussions. This is in addition to the high-school representatives who are mostly teachers who have been involved for over a year now in the core-course review process in these subcommittees.

In reviewing the process of initial eligibility and in particular the core courses that we're going to focus on now, there were some basic premises that we began with. First of all, we stated at the table that as members of the higher education community, it is reasonable to expect the NCAA to establish initial-eligibility standards for student-athletes.

We are still very concerned about the ability for students to be well prepared academically when they begin college considering the extra demands and pressures that will be added to their slate when they compete in inter-collegiate competition. However, we also must do a better job communicating these standards to parents, prospects and the high-school community.

Secondly, there is an acknowledgment that perhaps high-school administrators really are in the best position to evaluate their own course offerings from any of the criticisms that I mentioned a moment ago. But this would be done against our standards.

Thirdly, the NCAA must continue to play a role in monitoring course submissions to help ensure integrity of the process.

Fourth, the NCAA is committed to a continuing examination of the evolving nature of high-school instruction. We also need to in the future continue this process to look at our bylaws and our provisions to make sure they are consistent with what is happening in the educational world. Fifth, we need to continue to develop a partnership with the secondary school community. I emphasize "continued," because we feel that we have had a dialogue for some time, despite some of the criticism. We also do view this as a partnership.

From the initial recommendations to the review process, there were two main components. The first component was to shift more of the responsibility for identifying core courses to the high school and in particular the high-school principals or each appropriate administrator who would be reviewing their course offering and comparing them to the NCAA standards. Secondly, it was recommended that the Core-Course Review Committees identify specific criteria in each discipline that would guide administrators in reviewing their courses and give them a better understanding of our standards.

These original recommendations were reviewed by numerous committees, the Division II Management Council and Presidents Council, Division I corresponding groups and a variety of NCAA staff. In each of those, high-school representatives were asked to bring their ideas back to their constituents to talk about this. That occurred through September and October.

The representatives did solicit feedback from their constituents. I feel sorry for Kevin Lennon and Israel Negron, who got more than 100 responses from the high-school community of which they had to read and summarize for us. But the response and the feedback was overwhelming. We used this feedback to revise and fine tune our recommendations for change. And this weekend the final proposal, which I'll outline the key aspects in a moment,

was approved by both the Division II Management Council and the Presidents Council. But briefly, in terms of the procedure and how it might differ from what Pam already told you, we still plan on sending 48-H renewals out each year. This will be done in February beginning this academic year. But with the 48-H renewal forms will be specific work sheets that have been developed in each discipline area that include the criteria that we've discussed and better clarify what is meant by a core course in that area.

The principles and high-school administrators review their course offerings, their current 48-H Form and the criteria that are sent to them from the clearinghouse and decide which courses they may want to add to their renewal form. Their signatures are required and will attest to the accuracy and appropriateness of their decisions.

Our hope is to have these forms returned to the clearinghouse by April 1 and within 30 days of receipt of the renewal form have the clearinghouse review the submitted material and respond to the high school. Within this type of time frame, the 48-H renewal process will be completed in time for high schools to use it as an advising tool for students long before they enter their senior year and long before we get into the problem of having students and names attached to a waiver process or a decision made retroactively after a student has graduated.

The clearinghouse will accept late submissions from high schools, but we hope that with the involvement of the high-school administrators and the message that they've been getting out, that these will be sent in a more timely manner.

We all agree that courses should be college preparatory; however, the high-school community had some problem with that terminology. But basically what we meant and what we clarified is that a course is intended to prepare students for college. We have seen in these subcommittees on core-course review some amazing courses that people claim to be college prep and it's debatable to say the least. The course must be offered at a high school's regular academic level. This excludes remedial courses. Independent study and correspondence courses are not permissible. This is the way it's been and we have not changed. However, there are times when courses are offered through individualized instruction that may be permissible. Finally, the other general guideline is that the course must satisfy instructional content in the work sheets that I've mentioned for each academic discipline.

There is a form that you will be seeing soon because the institutions will also receive copies. This is one for English, but what's noted on these work-sheets is a clarification of those four general principles that I just mentioned, the college preparatory aspect and so on. This particular example gives you what are some examples of acceptable NCAA core courses in English and reminds them of the 75-percent content rule. It also lists some things that are clearly what we call policy "nos" or are not acceptable. Then there are some other places where we've had a course that may be acceptable, but it really depends on how it is taught and the contexts. Some examples of that and some clarifications are listed as well.

So with these clarified standards, one for the English, one for the natural and physical sciences, math and so on, we hope that the administrators can take this and much more clearly identify, based on their course curriculum, what is acceptable and what is not. The role then of the clearinghouse in this process should be much more streamlined. Essentially, the clearinghouse is going to review the 48-H renewal forms that come back for very specific

things. Clearly policy "nos," lists of things that have been identified by the subcommittees that will never be accepted. Pam mentioned firefighting as an English course. Don't laugh, we've actually seen things like that. The clearinghouse will identify future additional review criteria related to circumstances when courses come in late, especially after a student has already graduated, and also do routine review of the core-course renewal sheets and 48-H Forms, not so much to pick on individual schools or courses, but to look at what are the changing trends, how has a course or a high school changed their 48-H Form over the years, what are the evolving changes in terms of the titles of courses and so on. So it gives us some information to look at in this evolving and constantly changing nature of educational reform.

Finally, there are still issues to be considered in this review process. We're still exploring ways in which we can develop better partnerships and communication within the secondary education community. We felt we were doing a lot in making great strides until we got USA Today Friday. We need to look at mechanisms by which we can identify and train regional representatives to help high schools. We've heard a lot of complaints from high schools that say we don't understand what you want us to do, we don't understand what you mean by a core course, we don't understand your rules, is there a way we can have training seminars for high schools?

Consideration of alternative education programs such as charter schools, home study and so on are going to create some interesting avenues for us to explore as well as the whole issue of the learning-disabled community and the impact of the legislation on that.

The fourth area is an area that we would really like some input. For instance, there is a trend nationwide to move against knowledge measurement in the traditional sense and look more at competency-based learning. How do we match our bylaws and regulations with that? Should we be looking at eighth-grade courses, independent study courses and credit by exam? Should we revise our instructional content? Have we made mistakes? Should we look at the impact of the initial-eligibility rules on noncertified student-athletes? And is there a way that we can identify obvious qualifiers so that a student could be certified before they graduate from high school just because of their obvious good quality or good standing as an academic student?

These kinds of issues still need to be explored at least for the next year. We would be very interested in getting feedback from the membership in terms of revising our legislation in order to better accommodate the criticisms that we've heard about the process.

At this point, if there are any comments or questions about anything that any of us have said, we'll be welcome to try to answer them for you.

Gerald Beer (California State University, Los Angeles): What do you do with the few high schools that will organize their courses along thematic or interdisciplinary lines?

Ms. Lisko: We have looked at interdisciplinary lines on several of the core-course committees. Basically, what we're looking for is what does the high school give them credit for?

English seems to be one of those that cross the disciplinary areas. We've seen English paired with science. We've seen English paired with history. We've seen English paired with social studies or other civics. We basically look for the same type of things we would look for in the English area and/or in the social studies area. If it's a one-credit course, we will generally give them a half of a credit of English and a half of a credit of social studies.

In some cases, these classes will meet a double period the entire time. So they will give them one unit of science and one unit of English and we would follow suit, but that is a good example. I appreciate that question because that's a good example of the type of things that a lot of schools are doing. Those avenues are well open for getting acceptability for those courses.

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): I think you and the committee should be commended for the job and the work you've done. However, I'd like for us since we just dealt with issues, to maybe consider in the future making sure that with the whole regard to learning-disabled students, that learning-disabled students are not given greater latitude, that it isn't penalizing students who are going the regular way of going about the clearinghouse core courses and what-have-you.

I know from the report the other day from our people in Washington we have a number of cases now that are against the NCAA as it deals with learning-disabled students. Yet, it seems in some of the appeal and waiver processes that learning-disabled students were maybe given greater latitude when students of normal progress had exceptional grades, but because of standardized testing, they were not given a waiver.

I think that whole issue needs to be revisited. Again, I appreciate the work that you've done, but I think we still have a lot of work to do.

Ms. Lisko: Thank you very much, Clint. That learning-disabled area is certainly one area that is of great concern. It's one that academic requirements is looking at on a continuous basis.

The high schools on that 48-H Form do have an area that they can get acceptability for a learning-disabled course. Classes designed for students who have a learning disability does not preclude them from being listed specifically as a core course. Once it's listed on that as an acceptable core course, it is not questioned anymore, but we certainly will be reviewing the other issues associated with learning disabilities.

RULE SIMPLIFICATION AND DEREGULATION

Mr. Herbert: Thank you very much, Mary, and thanks to all of your colleagues.

Now, the final report. We think that you should be aware of some of the major things taking place with regard to deregulation and rule simplification. The Presidents Council has made this a high priority. We've asked that the Management Council take a very hard look at this. I'd now like to introduce Leon Kerry, who is commissioner of the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association and also chair of the Division II Legislation Committee, to discuss this issue.

Leon G. Kerry (Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association): Good afternoon. I've been asked to speak to the membership on behalf of the committee.

The Division II Presidents Council and Management Council has charged the Division II Legislation Committee with studying issues relating to rule simplification and deregulation of the Division II management. During our October meeting, the committee, which I will introduce in a few minutes, agreed that deregulation of the Division II management is a top priority and one of the committee's most significant projects over the next few years.

The newly federated governing structure provides Division II with the unique opportunity to eliminate legislation that was enacted because of need or a desire of one or both of the other two divisions. We are looking at this opportunity to create a management that is consistent with the Division II

philosophy and responsive to the needs of the membership. We want to reduce the amount of legislation and focus on making the Manual more user-friendly. This is a great opportunity for us to design a format that facilitates effective, efficient use of this Manual.

I guess the biggest question is how are we going to do it? Well, the committee intends to deregulate the Manual one bylaw at a time, recognizing that careful deregulation is more important than quick, ineffective change.

The committee also believes it is very important to get input from the membership—people who use it everyday and who are most affected by the day-to-day impact. We have identified two forums to seek information. The first is an issue summit. This is an opportunity for athletics administrator representatives, coaches, student-athlete advisory committees and Division II commissioners to get together and talk about deregulation and how we're going to do it. I can't give you a date yet. Right now, it's probably late spring or early summer, the next at this annual Convention. I hope by the next time that I speak to you, I can give you a positive report and we can be well on our way as far as deregulating and simplifying the Manual.

Today, we want to pass out a form with the deregulations ideas. At the bottom of this form, it says to complete and leave in the room. We don't want you to do that. We want you to take the form with you, give it some thought and mail it back. We really need some thought on that.

At this time, I'm going to introduce the rest of the committee. Before I do that, the committee has been subdivided into two subcommittees. The first committee is the Legislative Review Committee: Paul Englemann, chair; Dede Allen, member; Margaret Harbison, Christ Petrouleas and Sharon Taylor. The next committee is the interpretation subcommittee: Robert L. Heiny, chair; members, Fred Gruninger, Michael Kovalchik, Wil G. Shaw and Jerry Vandergriff.

At this time, I would like to open the floor for comments or questions on the process of deregulation. It's your turn.

Thank you very much.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Herbert: Ladies and gentlemen, we have now concluded the official Division II business to be conducted during the 1998 NCAA Convention.

Is there anything else to come before the floor?

Edward Hammond (Fort Hays State University): A review of the print-out on the electronic voting on the football issue has determined that there are a number of institutions that voted that were not recorded. They weren't recorded one way or the other. It was just blank. That has been brought to the attention of the staff. I would like to ask the Management Council to review the process, procedure and validity of that vote. I believe it's too late to reconsider the vote. It's not appropriate because so many members have left to revoke that issue at this time. But it may be appropriate for the Management Council to refer it for next year's Convention for review.

Mr. Herbert: As chair of the Presidents Council, I will refer this to the Management Council for its review. I do want to note, however, that this is one of the reasons that we urge everyone to get a copy of the balloting results. Institutions can look at the results. If there appear to be questions, that is the reason for the reconsideration period. Having said that, we will definitely ask the Management Council to take a look at this issue and advise the Presidents Council of its conclusions. Is there anything else to come before the business session?

Kelly J. Higgins (University of Alaska Fairbanks): Last year, we discussed an issue that I haven't heard about yet this year. I discussed it with my colleague, Mr. Dillon. The Management Council met and discussed issues around the moratorium and the lifting thereof. I know there is supposedly another meeting tomorrow to discuss. I want to see what the status is.

Mr. Herbert: Let me explain what has happened. All three divisions' presidents groups are recommending that the moratorium be lifted. That will be presented to the Executive Committee tomorrow afternoon. We will take action at that time on that issue.

If it is lifted, the Executive Committee will also establish the exact date on which that will occur. We will be sharing information with you through the normal news channels. Is there anything else to come before the business session?

Ralph McFillen (Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Association): I wanted a clarification and a little more information on the enhancement fund issue that has been before the transition Budget and Finance Committee. Based on the report I heard, the recommendation says that one-half of that will stay as it has and the other half will be given to conferences based on membership. Is that what I heard?

Mr. Herbert: Nancy? That is correct.

Mr. McFillen: That goes to the full Budget and Finance Committee?

Mr. Herbert: That is correct.

Mr. McFillen: Then that committee is going to consider that and will then pass its recommendation, whatever it is, on to the...

Mr. Herbert: Management Council.

Mr. McFillen: Management Council. Then it goes to the Presidents Council?

Mr. Herbert: That's correct.

Mr. McFillen: So in digesting what they had recommended, it is in essence equal distribution. The equal distribution is on both ends, even though there was a vote in 1996 to change the enhancement fund. The vote was 55 percent opposed to changing the enhancement fund. Then we got to last year's survey, which had a multitude of options in it. The vote in that particular survey on equal distribution was in essence 28 to 30 percent strongly for and strongly opposed. We're still back to an equal distribution recommendation, as I see it.

I would like to suggest, although we don't have enough people to take a straw vote, I would really like for the membership of that committee to consider in its recommendation some criteria based on success in championship play or sports sponsorship. If we are about broad-based programs, if we are in a competitive atmosphere, why don't we reward people to some degree for success and sponsorship of sports programs?

So while the opportunity to reconsider is passed and the environment is not right, I really think that the majority of people believe in and support that type of proposal. While equal distribution seems to be the simplest and easiest direction to go, I would encourage us not to base all of our distribution on an equal-distribution formula.

Mr. Herbert: We will definitely convey that message to the committee.

Karen L. Miller (California State Polytechnic University, Pomona): I'd like to go back to the moratorium question. If it is reconsidered and is rescinded, will there be consideration then to request further additional funding or additional funding to support the possible increase in membership?

Mr. Herbert: As we were negotiating the 4.37 percent, one of the agree-

ments that was reached was that in the event of extraordinary circumstances, Divisions II and III could ask the Executive Committee for additional resources that would compensate us appropriately for a significant increase in new institutions joining our divisions.

At this point, we just don't know what the magnitude of that is going to be. At our Presidents Council meeting yesterday, we did ask the Management Council to refer to the appropriate committee the analysis of several issues. One was to take a look at things like fees for applications. We asked them to take a look at sports sponsorships for new members coming in. We also asked them to consider the possibility of a rule change that would essentially extend the time line for when a university would be eligible to receive enhancement dollars. As you know, in the case of Division I, it's eight years. We asked them to look at whether or not a time frame between one year and eight may be appropriate to assure that institutions are coming into the NCAA and into Division II for the right reasons; and that money, albeit its small amount, is not a consideration for institutions as they make that decision.

The Management Council will be looking at that simultaneously. As you know, we also have a four-year period during which institutions must assure us that they are ready for membership in the Association. I think that the combination of those will limit at least short term the total number of institutions that will come in at one time. But we do have that option of going back to the Association's Executive Committee for additional resources should this become a very significant problem. Right now, in looking at the numbers, we don't see that it's necessarily going to be a major problem for us, but it is something that we are monitoring very carefully and will continue to do so.

Are there any other questions or observations before I ask for a motion to adjourn?

Rudy Carvajal (California State University, Bakersfield): I would like to suggest a new view as we're going through change and moving forward. It deals obviously with budget and finance, but conceptually perhaps we should take a new approach in terms of marketing and a long-range plan for Division II.

First of all, we might even look at Division II. Division II has a connotation to some that it's lesser than I for some reason. I think that we have great opportunities when we talk about communication, we talk about education. What are some of the mechanisms that we have of communicating? Well, obviously the media and several of their obviously important aspects.

But as young people have opportunities to read, to watch on television, we have a great opportunity in our championship events to televise those events, get them before young people and the public at large, looking at the quality of the young men and women who represent these institutions. To me, it's a shame. I don't think we've done a very good job of that. I hold myself partially responsible for that as well.

But I think we do have a new opportunity and a new era. I would hope that when we look at these new moneys that are coming to the Division II membership, that they also look at not trying to fix some of our holes that we know that they have that are continuous on an operating basis, but look at the opportunity to develop something new, something we've never had before, and really convey a message that these student-athletes who represent our institutions should be looked upon with the same vigor and excite-

ment as those who are competing at other higher levels of athletics competition, so to speak.

Mr. Herbert: Thank you very much. That was an issue that was discussed at the Presidents Council meeting—the importance of marketing our programs. We will be following up on that. I'm glad you raised it also because it tells me that the two Councils are definitely on the same page with the membership on some of these important issues. Is there anything else?

James Fallis (University of Northern Colorado): On the enhancement issue, could I please get clarification on the effective date, what the distribution is, when is the first year for that and how long, and how long do we go under the present system?

Nancy L. Mitchell (NCAA Staff): The 1999-00 year is the effective date that went with the Budget Finance Subcommittee's recommendation. But we don't know if that's going to remain. I think that would be the earliest, Jim, that a change would be made. So, it could be later depending on what the recommendation is.

Mr. Fallis: So the membership does have some additional opportunities to present alternatives or additional suggestions?

Ms. Mitchell: Yes, Jim, the Budget and Finance Committee is meeting March 21. If you've got thoughts, comments, input, make sure you get them to me, Mike or Lynette, who works with that committee. They'll be meeting at that time so make sure you do it before then.

Mr. Fallis: On the first survey, there were so many options and alternatives. I'd like to suggest, although we all hate surveys, that we take the top three, send them back out to the membership and get a sense of how it feels about the top three versus eight or 10.

Ms. Mitchell: I appreciate that. We'll note that for the committee, Jim.

Mr. Herbert: Is there anything else?

Clint Bryant (Augusta State University): I think discussions in regard to the enhancement fund have been good during the additional business session. But I think when Tony Ceddia, the chair of the Budget and Finance Committee was here, he left with the impression that the membership was fine with the direction of the finance subcommittee.

I think in the future when we have this type of discussion and this type of forum, that people need to address the issues during the given time so that the committee can get the adequate feedback. Since people are very concerned, I would encourage them to send whatever comments they may have in that regard to Tony Ceddia, the chair of the Budget and Finance Committee.

Mr. Herbert: Thank you very much. Let me on behalf of the Presidents Council and Management Council thank you very much for your attention this afternoon and for your active involvement in the business session. We hope all of you share our belief that Division II is functioning very well in the restructured NCAA.

If there is no further business to come before the Division II membership this afternoon, the chair will entertain a motion for adjournment.

It's been moved. Is there a second? All in favor, please say "aye." Opposed, "no." The ayes have it. The meeting is adjourned.

■ Division III Business Session

Monday Morning, January 12, 1998

The Division III business session was called to order at 8:10 a.m., with Curtis L. McCray, Millikin University, presiding.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. McCray: Good morning. Welcome to the Division III business session. This is our first of three such sessions. I am Curt McCray, president of Millikin University and chair of the Division III Presidents Council. I will be with you to chair the Division III business sessions that will take place today and tomorrow morning. Joining me are Lois De Fleur, president of the State University of New York at Binghamton and vice-chair of the Presidents Council; Bridget Belgiovine, director of athletics at the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse and chair of the Division III Management Council; Stan Caine, president of Adrian College and vice-chair of the Management Council; Ralph McBride, secretary-treasurer of the Indiana Collegiate Athletic Conference, who will serve as our parliamentarian; Dan Dutcher, who serves as Division III chief of staff; and Carolayne Henry, who is a membership services representative at the national office and will serve as our interpretive expert during our discussion of proposed legislation. As usual, a court reporter will help us create an accurate record of our meetings.

A procedure that we must handle is to adopt the Convention Official Notice and Program before beginning our business. I will now ask for a motion to adopt the notice and program for the Division III business sessions.

[The motion was made, seconded and approved.]

Mr. McCray: Permit me now to review the timetable related to today's agenda. Our job between now and 5 p.m. is to complete the portion of the Division III agenda identified on Pages 8 and 9 of the Convention Program. We will meet until 12 today, depending on how rapidly you care to work, at which time we will break for lunch. After lunch, we will reconvene here at 1:30 and meet until 5 p.m. We will begin our business this morning by receiving reports from the Presidents Council and Management Council. Next, we will vote on our division legislation. We will consider as of this moment a total of seven legislative proposals. We will handle all of them today.

When that time comes, I will turn over the gavel to Bridget. She will review the necessary information related to our voting procedures and preside over our consideration of those proposals. After we complete our voting, we will discuss the important issue of strategic planning in Division III. The discussion of strategic planning will include how and why the new plan was developed and the role the plan will play in the overall governance and development of our division. As part of our planning discussion, we will also hear from representatives of selected Division III committees, which will report on their chief activities during the last year and also reflect on issues in the plan that may affect the work of that committee in the future. We will also receive a brief update regarding the work of selected Association-wide committees.

Following the committee reports, we will begin our championships sessions. First, we will hear a presentation explaining the current initiative to increase postseason opportunities in football. Then, we will hear a similar session explaining the status of the review of automatic-qualification criteria. The focus of those two sessions will be for educational purposes. When we reconvene at 1:30, we will then conduct two separate discussion forums. The first forum will be dedicated to the football issue; the second forum will focus on the automatic-qualification issue. We encourage your involvement during those discussions.

After we conclude our championship discussions, we will hear from a panel regarding gender equity and Title IX issues from a Division III perspective. The Title IX session should take us to the end of the day. If we have any time left, we will open the floor for questions. We intend, again, to adjourn by 5 p.m.

As you can tell, we have a busy schedule. We'll need to stay on time, so I encourage you to be prompt when you return from lunch and your breaks. It is the chair's intent to begin and end on time.

This might be an opportune moment for me to comment as chair of the Presidents Council with regard to my personal sense of how the new governance structure has worked during the past year and of the kinds of things I think we've achieved as a result.

This Convention represents the conclusion of a very important year in the history of the NCAA, especially for our division. During the last six months, we have implemented a new governance structure. This has been a major accomplishment. It would not have been possible without the vision, the cooperation and the very hard work of a great number of people, many of whom are in this room. For this, I think we are all thankful.

We now have our own federated governance, a structure that provides us with the kind of independence we've not had before. This is both exciting and intimidating. It excites us because it offers many opportunities for growth and change. It means for the first time we can, indeed, use our own institutional divisional philosophy to guide us. But it's also intimidating because it places on us a responsibility that we have never held alone, a responsibility that we must take advantage of. All of us—CEOs, athletics administrators, faculty reps, conference officials, student-athletes and coaches—share the responsibility to make the governance structure a success.

I believe we're off to a good start toward achieving that goal. Our committee structure is in place and is now fully operational. Every Division III committee has met at least once, as you will hear later this morning. We are approaching closure on some very important unfinished championship business from last year, and I have every reason to believe that today's meetings and discussion will bear handily on that. We also have begun serious dialogue regarding automatic qualification for championships, an issue of critical importance. Tomorrow morning, we will begin a similar dialogue regarding our financial aid regulations, a defining characteristic of Division III.

You probably noted that we do not have many legislative proposals to consider this year. I think that's good. That may reflect well, in part, on the new federated legislative process. But I caution you against assuming that future Conventions will be equally light. There are many significant legislative issues on the horizon, including possible changes to our financial aid and playing- and practice-season rules as well as legislative deregulation. Moreover, the Convention is more than simply an opportunity to vote on leg-

islation. It is also an opportunity to share ideas with colleagues and to learn from each other. We should commit to taking better advantage of that opportunity in the future no matter what our legislative agenda may seem to be.

I want to emphasize that I believe our new governance structure is functioning quite well. We've encountered some minor growing pains that were to be expected, but overall I believe recommendations are flowing as they should between our standing committees and the Management Council and particularly between the Management Council and the Presidents Council. Throughout the past year, I have witnessed unprecedented cooperation between the Presidents Council and the Management Council. The Management Council is handling initial committee recommendations and the many other important details that make up the business and operation of our division.

The Presidents Council has behaved like a Presidents Council ought to and has consistently ratified the Management Council's recommendations in that regard. It's not to say that the Presidents Council has been passive in this matter, but it is to say that once we have received recommendations through the Management Council that are well thought out and well developed, we have behaved like CEOs and accepted those recommendations. It is focused on letting the Management Council do its work and reacting to rather than duplicating those efforts. Both groups have assumed a very comfortable and effective working relationship, I believe.

I'm also happy to report that our student-athletes are taking a greater role than ever in the governance of our division, including active participation on four of our standing committees and on our Management Council. Division III is a leader in that area, and I think we can all be proud of that fact. That is an innovation that is working well. Many of those student-athletes are here today and will participate in our business session. These young women and young men represent the best of what the NCAA is all about. I wonder if those student-athletes who are present would stand and be recognized, please. (Applause) Many thanks to all of you. I assume that none of you is missing class. Thank you for enduring my report.

In short, we have made great progress, during our crucial first year, but our journey down this path has just begun. I encourage all of you to work harder than ever during the coming year to ensure the success of our new structure. Thank you for this opportunity to share my thoughts with you.

We're now prepared to receive the Presidents Council and Management Council reports. For the first report, I would like to introduce President Lois De Fleur from the State University of New York at Binghamton. President De Fleur has served as chair of the Presidents Council as well as chair of the Division III Budget Committee. She will present the Council's annual report. President De Fleur.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL REPORT

Lois B. DeFleur (State University of New York at Binghamton): Good morning. Thank you for that thorough report. I'd like to talk about the priorities in our work of the Presidents Council.

First and foremost, we've been concerned about making the new governance structure work. We're not only concerned about making it work in terms of its structure, but also in terms of our interaction and the process. Accordingly, in March, we held the first-ever joint meeting of both the Management Council and Presidents Council. We talked a lot about our

respective roles and any concerns that we would have in order to get on with our business. We also set up our committee structure.

That March meeting was also important because we took very seriously the feedback from last year's Convention regarding championships. We had a summit in terms of the issues regarding championships. After reviewing the feedback, the Presidents Council and the Management Council representatives concluded that, consistent with our philosophy, greater emphasis should be given to in-season regional play and conference championships. We made that very clear to both the sports committees and the Championships Committee. Both Councils also agreed to consider recommendations to change the football championships, which we will be discussing later today.

You'll hear about other issues later. One is strategic planning. The Presidents Council wholeheartedly supports the effort to have a strategizing process and the substance of a plan so that we can move forward and set our priorities.

Another major issue that you will hear about today that we spent a lot of time discussing is financial aid. Obviously, this goes right to the heart of Division III and who we are and the philosophy. We concluded that the Financial Aid and Awards Committee and the Management Council should approach this issue in a most deliberative manner. We will see how this begins to evolve.

We also agreed that the chair and the vice-chair of the Presidents Council should serve on the Association-wide Executive Committee. Curtis McCray and I have done that during this year with the other divisional representatives.

We also approved guiding principles for the new Division III Budget, Championships and Nominating Committees. The Presidents Council developed the principles, and we're working with these other committees. We also very much want to continue to find ways to increase the involvement of presidents and chancellors of our institutions. We are very gratified that in our division we have a significant increase at this meeting of CEOs. We had an excellent CEO forum yesterday.

Finally, we appointed President Judith Kuipers, who is chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, as the Council's new vice-chair. Thank you very much.

Mr. McCray: Thank you, Lois. It has been a real privilege to chair the Council during its inaugural year. I'm indebted to Lois and to all of my colleagues on that body for their leadership and hard work during 1997.

As are you, we are all volunteers. It's important that we express our gratitude to each other for the kind of work that we do. At this moment, I'd like to express my gratitude to President De Fleur and to President Jay Oliva of New York University, whose terms on the Presidents Council will end at the conclusion of this Convention. We are grateful to both of them for their dedicated service to Division III during this important time. Would you, as volunteers, help me thank these volunteers for their work by joining your hands? (Applause)

Our second report will describe the work of the Division III Management Council during the past year. It will be presented by Bob Williams, director of athletics at Swarthmore College. In addition to his service on the Management Council, Bob also has served on the Championships Committee and the former Division III Restructuring Task Force. He is someone whose face is very familiar to us and who has given devoted service to this organization. Bob.

MANAGEMENT COUNCIL REPORT

Robert E. Williams (Swarthmore College): Thank you, President McCray. First, I'd like to introduce the members of the Management Council. As I read your names, would you please stand?

Jim Appleton, president, University of Redlands; Al Bean, University of Southern Maine; Bridget Belgiovine, our chair, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; John Biddiscombe, Wesleyan University (Connecticut); Stan Caine, president, Adrian College; Lynda Calkins, Hollins College; Carlyle Carter, Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Kerry Gotham, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Nazareth College; Mary Jo Gunning, Marywood University; Maureen Hager, Allegheny College; Linda Hopple, Middle Atlantic States Conference; Walter Johnson, North Central College; Linda Moulton, Clark University (Massachusetts); Louise O'Neal, Wellesley College; Dick Rasmussen, University Athletic Association; Ginny Studer, State University of New York at Brockport; Truman Turnquist, Mount Union College; Christy Wilson, Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Nebraska Wesleyan University.

I'd also like to acknowledge Dan Dutcher, chief of staff, Division III. These individuals do excellent work on behalf of our division. Would you please join me in a round of applause? (Applause)

On behalf of the Management Council, I would like to provide a report of our work during 1997. It has been an exciting and challenging year. A significant amount of time was expended finalizing details related to the new Division III structure, our committee process and communication.

Of great significance for the Management Council was the expansion from 11 to 19 members, including two student-athlete voting representatives. The larger group has added a great deal more opportunity for dialogue on all issues.

Immediately after the 1997 Convention, the Management Council reviewed Proposals 76 and 77. If you remember, both proposals address the issue of maximum contest limitations for student-athletes in the sports of football and basketball. Following a membership survey, the Council recommended no changes to the current legislation.

We conducted a Division III summit and orientation in March. The two days included a summit with members of the Presidents Council, Management Council and selected individuals from the former restructuring task force to review Convention results regarding the Division III championship structure discussion and the football enhancement issue.

The summit was followed by an orientation meeting with members of the Budget, Championships and Nominating Committees, focusing on policies and procedures and committee interrelationships and communication, and concluded with a joint meeting of the Management Council and the Presidents Council. This session focused on communication and the relationship between the two Councils. It also focused on long-term goals and vision for Division III. This included the process for development of a Division III strategic plan, which you will hear more about later.

The two days concluded with an articulation of the future direction of Division III championships, including the structure of football, and a much better understanding about the roles of the Championships Committee, Budget Committee, Management Council, Presidents Council and the membership in the process.

General Management Council business included the development of our operating policies and procedures, a review of Division III committee and

Association-wide committee representation and processes, and the identification of subcommittees to handle specific responsibilities delegated to the Council.

To facilitate the oversight of our governance structure, at least one Management Council representative serves on every Division III and Association-wide committee. A significant amount of time was spent reviewing the good work and recommendations of Division III and Association-wide committees. Our goal of greater involvement and communication with the membership will be reflected in several Division III committee oral reports presented by the chairs and Management Council representatives this morning and written reports from Association-wide committees.

We spent a considerable amount of time on issues related to strategic planning, championships, membership and financial aid. We are excited about the future direction of Division III. After our voting this morning, President Caine, vice-chair of our Management Council, will present an overview of our Division III strategic plan.

On the championship front, in April, the membership received the statement of the Division III Presidents Council and the Management Council regarding championships, which reaffirmed the philosophy of Division III and communicated our immediate goals related to championship structure and a guide for future championship discussion. The Championships Committee worked diligently and responded with a first draft of Division III automatic-qualification principles, which was discussed with chairs of sports committees in early August. A second draft was endorsed by the presidents and forwarded to the membership for comment.

At the same time, football bracket expansion has been reviewed and two proposals were recommended for membership discussion. Both of these championship issues will be described in more detail this morning and can be discussed and debated in detail this afternoon.

Membership issues included the refinement of the provisional process and the Division III institutional self-study guide, which is in final stages of completion. Our Membership Committee has done excellent work.

Issues regarding the application of Division III financial aid legislation continue to be a priority. The Division III Financial Aid and Awards Committee spent a considerable amount of time discussing several issues. This topic has been identified as a major discussion item for our Tuesday morning session.

We've reviewed the Association's marketing, licensing and promotion initiatives, including the corporate partner program and the "Power of One," which is the comprehensive football promotion program. We determined that from a Division III perspective, at this time, no action is necessary. Finally, we elected John Biddiscombe, athletics director at Wesleyan University, as our chair.

As you can tell, the Management Council and all Division III committees have had a busy year working through the details of our new structure. However, we believe that with our new structure, and especially with the individuals involved, Division III is in good hands and is prepared for all the challenges that lie ahead.

President McCray, that concludes my report. On a personal note, I would like to say that it has been an honor and a pleasure to serve Division III as a member of the Management Council. I thank sincerely Bridget Belgiovine and Stan Caine for outstanding leadership. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. McCray: Thank you, Bob, for that report and for your hard work. You've been most evident in all that's preceded in the past year. I should note that Bob is one of five persons who is completing terms of service on the Management Council. Along with Bob, this group of "completers" includes Jim Appleton, president at the University of Redlands; Bridget Belgiovine; Linda Hopple, executive director of the Middle Atlantic States Conference; and Linda Moulton, director of athletics at Clark University (Massachusetts).

From my perspective, I'm extremely grateful to the Management Council. That is the place where a lot of the real heavy lifting related to the work that we do and the governance of Division III takes place. Were it left to the presidents, I don't think we could manage it. All five of these persons have made significant contributions to the governance of our division during a most critical transition time. Please join me once again in expressing our gratitude for their dedication and commitment to Division III over the past years. (Applause)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

We are now ready to vote on the seven legislative proposals identified for your consideration. I would like to ask Bridget to please lead us through that process. Bridget.

Bridget Belgiovine (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): Thank you, President McCray. Good morning, delegates. We will vote this morning on six legislative proposals. Number 21 has been withdrawn. We will vote on 20 through 26, which are noted in your Convention Notice. We'll vote on these proposals in numerical order, as listed in Appendix A of your Convention Notice, unless at this point there is a motion to reorder. Seeing no one moving to the microphones...

Proposals No. 20 and 22 are marked with an asterisk in Appendix A because they are part of the Presidents Council grouping. We will conduct roll-call electronic voting on those two proposals. We will then consider Proposals No. 23 through 26. We will use paddles to vote on those proposals unless the results are too close to call, and then we will go to our electronic voting units.

[Note: Electronic voting procedures were explained.]

As we begin, I would like to remind you to please state your name and institution for the record when you proceed to the microphone and are recognized by the chair. We will begin by considering Proposal No. 20.

Gambling Activities

Albert D. Bean Jr. (University of Southern Maine): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 20.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal will ensure that the legislative restrictions related to gambling activities will apply to conference staff members. These same provisions currently apply to campus athletics department staff members and student-athletes. We all should be familiar with the serious threat that gambling presents to college athletics. The adoption of this proposal will represent another important step in our efforts to address this important issue.

Arleigh Dodson (Northwest Conference of Independent Colleges): If 10.3 is amended and there is no other action, then how is the disciplinary action to be taken?

There are three choices. Choice 1: Just leave it amended as it is and no other action, in which case it's totally duplicitous because there can be no

penalty for the gambling. Choice 2: Amend Constitution 2 and Article 19 to enable choosing a full range, from secondary violation to the most serious violation, and applying the range of penalties. Choice 3: Amend 10.4, which appears an illogical choice, so that even an isolated or inadvertent violation, that is, a secondary violation, is treated parallel to institutional personnel as is currently the case in current Bylaw 10.4.

Note, just so everyone is very clear, the language is, and I quote: "If you're found in violation of a provision of this regulation, shall ... it is not "may"; it is "shall" ... invoke 19.6.2.2." If you look at that list, that's a very heavy list.

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Arleigh. If, in fact, Proposal No. 20 is approved, we would forward that proposal to the Legislative Review Committee and they will discuss the related sections.

[Proposal No. 20 (Page A-24) was adopted, 273-9-2.]

Maximum Dates of Competition—Women's Lacrosse—Division III

Susan Bassett (Hobart and William Smith Colleges): On behalf of Hobart and William Smith Colleges and the SUNYAC conference, I move that we adopt Proposal No. 22.

[The motion was seconded.]

I urge the membership to support Proposal 22 allowing in the sport of women's lacrosse 17 dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates of competition in the nontraditional segment.

This legislation allows the same opportunity for participation that is currently available in field hockey and soccer. The teaching opportunity provided by the nontraditional season is extremely valuable in skill development in this rapidly growing sport. Specialization in athletics is occurring long before a student-athlete reaches the college level. Let's not discourage accomplished student-athletes from choosing a Division III athletics experience by limiting their opportunity to participate.

Until we as an Association determine to eliminate all nontraditional seasons, we need to provide equitable opportunities in all sports. This legislation does not create an inequity with men's lacrosse. It is an entirely different game. The leadership in that sport chose not to pursue the change at this time. In fact, what we're proposing parallels what currently exists in Division I men's and women's lacrosse. Please adopt Proposal 22.

Suzanne R. Coffey (Bates College): I rise to speak in support of this legislation, both as an individual member and as the chair of the Division III Women's Lacrosse Committee.

Women's lacrosse is one of the fastest growing sports in Division III. As my colleagues in the Midwest, the South and the West can attest, new programs are being added at a rapid rate across this country. The additional player-development opportunities afforded student-athletes in Division III soccer, field hockey and men's and women's volleyball through the utilization of the nontraditional segment should appropriately be afforded student-athletes in an expanding sport like women's lacrosse. Equity with other similar sports is but one issue. It is, however, the opportunity to teach this game that is at the very heart of this legislation.

I respect the concerns expressed by the Management Council with regard to the lack of similar legislation brought forth on behalf of men's lacrosse. However, I do not know of any reason why women's lacrosse and a women's sport should await the blessing and concurrence of a men's sport before adopting legislation that will help this woman's sport to grow and expand.

I ask that you support this legislation with the understanding that you are allowing young women who may or may not have learned this game in high school the opportunity to develop and test their skills while encouraging growth in this sport. Thank you.

Maureen Hager (Allegheny College): I speak in opposition to this proposal on behalf of both the Presidents Council and the Management Council. There are three concerns related to this proposal. The first concern relates to safety and conditioning. Five additional days of competition during the nontraditional segment could pose a health risk.

The second concern relates to equity. This proposal would only affect women's lacrosse. There is no companion proposal for men's lacrosse. The Women's Lacrosse Committee indicated the current limit of 17 dates is adequate. Both the Presidents Council and Management Council are against treating men's and women's lacrosse differently.

The third concern relates to the nontraditional season. Both Councils are in opposition to any proposal that would further establish the nontraditional segment. It seems that the nontraditional segment has arisen in a piecemeal fashion.

Rather than establish a segment in yet another sport, the more prudent course of action would be to review the existence of the nontraditional seasons. That is the course of action anticipated in the new strategic plan. For these reasons, we encourage you to oppose Proposal No. 22. Thank you.

Katelin Chmielinski (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Sweet Briar College): We would like to take this opportunity to express our support for Proposal No. 22.

We stand in support of Proposal No. 22 because we believe that it is an issue of equity among women's sports. Women's soccer, field hockey and softball already possess the opportunity to engage in or participate in a nontraditional season. This season does not increase the number of weeks within the lacrosse season. Rather, it increases the number of competition dates.

The NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee may reevaluate or explore the larger issue of the nontraditional season in the future. However, we are unwilling to arbitrarily prohibit women's lacrosse from engaging in a practice available to other women's sports without further study. Thank you.

Linda J. Case (State University College at Brockport): Our conference is supportive of the proposed legislation. After the comments that have been made, the support of the student-athletes should speak for itself. We need to give our female student-athletes an opportunity to participate in lacrosse in the nontraditional season. Thank you.

Gloria R. Scott (Bennett College): I'm a member of the Presidents Council and I rise to speak against the support of this motion at this particular time for the following reasons.

I think that the equity question is not the paramount question. The larger question is some orderly development of looking at what happens in the postseason. Many of us are faced with the issue of multiple sports in nontraditional seasons without the appropriate coaches or trainers or other persons who need to be present. Because of the multiplicity in Division III of coaches having several assignments, this is not always possible.

It seems that a broader sense of review within one year's time would allow for a much more comprehensive and prudent review of this, especially with the question of safety. I think that the question of traditional versus nontraditional with lacrosse, softball and field hockey is one that is growing. We

urge that you would consider allowing further study and review of this and to bring this back next year.

[Proposal No. 22 (Page A-25) was defeated, 62-162-43.]

Expenses for Participation in Olympic Exhibitions

Mary Jo Gunning (Marywood University): On behalf of the Presidents Council and as a member of the Division III Management Council and Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 23.

[The motion was seconded.]

After the 1996 Summer Olympic games, the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee received a request from the national governing body of gymnastics, USA Gymnastics, for assistance in determining whether NCAA regulations would permit student-athletes to receive actual and necessary expenses from the NGB to participate in its multicity post-Olympic tour exhibition involving Olympic team members and members of the national team.

Because the exhibitions did not involve actual competition, in other words, team-versus-team competition, or scoring, the rules interpretation rendered in this situation indicated that NCAA rules currently would not permit such expenses.

The Management Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believed that this technicality should be corrected. Both the Council and the committee have noted that other NCAA regulations permit under certain circumstances the receipt of actual and necessary expenses from the USOC, NGBs or another designated sponsor. Please note, not from the NCAA institution; namely, from USOC or developmental training programs and for promotional activities related to specific competitive events like the Olympic games.

Proposal No. 23 will remedy this shortcoming without disrupting student-athletes' class time or conflicting with institutional competitions. It may also be of interest to note that the Division I Board of Directors recently adopted this rule change for their division.

On behalf of the Management Council and the Olympic Sports Liaison Committee, I urge you to vote yes on Proposal No. 23. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 23 (Page A-27) was adopted.]

Eligibility—Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefit

Lynda J. Calkins (Hollins College): On behalf of the Division III Presidents Council and the Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 24.

[The motion was seconded.]

I move that Proposal No. 24 be adopted with an immediate effective date, as indicated in the Convention Notice. This proposal originated with the former NCAA Eligibility Committee. It establishes limited circumstances in which an institution does not have to declare a prospect or student-athlete ineligible and seek restoration of that individual's eligibility.

Basically, the restoration process can be avoided if the value of improper inducement or benefit was \$25 or less and an amount of equal value is paid to charity. Such a violation will still be considered an institutional violation and would have to be reported to the enforcement staff, so institutional accountability will be retained. The real benefit of this rule change will be for our student-athletes and prospects. A student-athlete or prospect will regain eligibility as soon as the money is repaid to the charity. This will sig-

nificantly streamline the eligibility restoration process. I encourage you to adopt Proposal No. 24. Thank you.

[Proposal No. 24 (Page A-28) was adopted.]

De Minimis Violations—Prospective and Enrolled Student-Athletes

Ms. Calkins: On behalf of the Presidents Council, Management Council and the Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 25.

[The motion was seconded.]

During the last three Conventions, the membership adopted legislation that eliminated the responsibility of each institution to declare a student-athlete or prospect ineligible for small, inconsequential types of violations.

These violations do not result in a benefit being provided to the prospect or student-athlete, and the institution seldom gains a recruiting or competitive advantage. It is important to note, however, that all violations of NCAA rules, including those in this proposal, must be reported to the NCAA enforcement staff. One or more of the penalties outlined in Bylaw 19.6.1 will continue to be imposed upon the institution and institutional employees. The only difference is that the eligibility of innocent prospects and student-athletes will not be affected.

The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement believes that this proposal is an effective and positive step toward deregulation of de minimis violations that currently affect a prospect's or student-athlete's eligibility. The Subcommittee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement strongly supports this proposal. I urge your support as well.

[Proposal No. 25 (Page A-32) was adopted.]

Membership Reclassification—Division III

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): On behalf of the Presidents Council and the Management Council, I move the adoption of Proposal No. 26.

[The motion was seconded.]

This proposal originated with the Division III Membership Committee, which I had the privilege of chairing. One of the committee's first orders of business was to review the legislative requirements necessary to become a member of Division III.

Our study uncovered the fact that we currently apply a much less demanding standard for members who wish to transfer from another division than the standards we apply to provisional members. For example, our current rules permit a Division II school transferring to Division III to grandfather existing athletics aid awards.

In addition, there is no requirement that schools complete a Division III institutional self-study to ensure that it is prepared to uphold both the spirit and substance of Division III membership during its Division III compliance period. The compliance period itself currently is only two years, a full two years shorter than the compliance period we now apply to our new provisional members.

This proposal will ensure that institutions wishing to be classified will be fully committed to the Division III philosophy. The compliance period will increase to three years. No athletics awards to freshmen or transfer students will be permitted during that period, and awards to existing student-athletes will be permitted only during the first year of the compliance period.

[Proposal No. 26 (Page A-33) was adopted.]

Ms. Belgiovine: At this point, that concludes our voting. However, we have a window of reconsideration that is available. Would any one of the delegates wish to reconsider a proposal? If not, the window of reconsideration is now closed. We have concluded our legislative voting. I'll now turn the gavel back to President McCray.

Mr. McCray: Thank you, Bridget. We have been so well disciplined this morning, we're running a bit ahead of schedule. Therefore, I'm going to alter the agenda slightly. We were due after the voting to take a break. I'm going to delay that until we've had a report from the Budget Committee.

I'm going to ask President De Fleur if she would come forward to give the report from the Budget Committee.

BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

Lois B. DeFleur (State University of New York at Binghamton): This is not an enviable position. I'm the only thing that stands between you and a break, so I'll move forward.

As vice-chair of the division, I chaired the Division III Budget Committee, which is a subcommittee of the Management Council. I am the outgoing chair. As you would suspect, President Judith Kuipers will move into the role as the new vice-chair of the division.

The Budget Committee has eight members and many of these individuals have been involved in the budget process for several years. The responsibilities of the committee are to review all budgetary requests that are forwarded by the Management Council and to ensure that both the annual and the long-term proposed expenditures are consistent with the fiscal priorities, which we're continuing to further develop through our strategic-planning process. The committee also monitors the administration of the annual budget.

The Budget Committee has developed some operating guidelines to assist in the budgetary requests that come forward. The guidelines include a minimum 10-percent annual allocation designated as a reserve at the beginning of each fiscal year. Any funds remaining at year end from the allocation can be designated for either specific membership initiatives or to go into the reserve. In the end, it goes through the Management Council and finally through the Presidents Council. We also stated in the guideline that the allocation of the Division III funds shall primarily benefit the membership as a whole as opposed to one segment of the membership.

The Budget Committee also has developed some spending priorities as guidelines and will continue to look at these guidelines as we work on the strategic plan. For example, the three current budgetary priorities are to make sure we have an annual reserve allocation; that we expend the funds needed related to membership growth; and that there is reasonable championship enhancements.

The committee also talked about the following guidelines related to championships: No. 1, Division III should fully fund championships consistent with our access to participant ratios; No. 2, common transportation and per diem guidelines should be applied to all Division III championships; No. 3, Division III should exercise financial prudence in the consideration of possible changes to our championship structure. In other words, we need to understand the fiscal implications of it.

Many of you saw in The NCAA News the specific amounts and the fiscal condition of this division. You saw on the inside page the graphs that indi-

cate the money allocated to Division III. Let me first give you a few highlights from 1996-97. Approximately \$5.68 million was spent in the division on Division III championships. Division III championships were up 9 percent from the previous year. We also were 6 percent over our allocated budget for championships, which came as a result of an increase in transportation expenses. As you probably have read, transportation expenses are up throughout the industry.

Also, beginning in 1997-98, we agreed that any unallocated dollars would be used to cover any excess expenses. We are in the good position of being very sound fiscally. What is our budget plan for 1997-98? Our allocation of the Association's budget is 3.18 percent of the total or \$8,094,000. Of that, we're allocating, or our plan is, the bulk of it to championships. A total of \$6,617,000 will be allocated to championships. That would mean, in addition, that we are putting aside 10 percent for our reserve, which is \$809,000. We have encumbered some funds for some proposed championship enhancements and expenditures of \$352,000. There are a certain number of unallocated funds, and that's \$668,000. So we are in a very sound fiscal state.

Also, with the negotiated proportion of the NCAA budget that Division III should receive, our funds will continue to increase. For example, in 1998-99, we have negotiated \$8.5 million; \$9 million for 1999-00; \$9.6 million for 2000-01; and in excess of \$10 million for 2001-02.

We are very proud of the way that Division III has spent its budget. In 1996-97, 7,500 athletes representing 238 institutions participated in our championships. About 60 percent of our total number of member institutions were represented. With the expansion of championship brackets in 1997-98 in baseball, men's and women's basketball, men's and women's soccer, softball, women's volleyball, and men's and women's lacrosse, the representational level of both our student-athletes and our institutions will continue to increase. Also, in 1997-98, the women's and men's indoor and outdoor track championships will be fully funded. Additional bracket and championship expansions will be primary considerations as we look to the future and our budget. Most of all, we are committed, as I know you are, to having a budget that implements our philosophy and ensures that our student-athletes have excellent athletics experiences.

I particularly would like to thank the Division III Budget Committee: Dan Bridges, California Institute of Technology; Stan Caine from Adrian College; Lynda Calkins from Hollins College; David Carter from Eastern Connecticut State University; John Harvey from Carnegie Mellon; Bob Neff, Juniata College; and Judy Sweet from the University of California, San Diego. They have worked long and hard as members of this committee. We certainly owe them a great debt of gratitude. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. McCray: Thank you, Lois. When we return from our break, we will begin the discussion of strategic planning and hear the remaining committee reports.

[A 15-minute recess was taken.]

STRATEGIC PLANNING DISCUSSION

Mr. McCray: Our next topic should be of great interest to the membership. We're going to discuss strategic planning and the specific plan for Division III.

The concept of strategic planning is a familiar one. We've all used it in our own assignments, in our own schools. But the concept has come slowly, for

one reason or another, to the NCAA. Reconstruction, reconfiguring and transformation of the NCAA have given us a great opportunity to apply the principles of strategic planning to our business. I am so pleased that Division III has thus far been the leader in strategic planning. The other divisions have undertaken it, but we appear to be well ahead.

Today, we will address our strategic planning in two parts. First, to discuss this process and to present the plan itself in more detail will be President Stan Caine of Adrian College. Stan, whom you've met in many, many guises, is vice-chair of the Management Council and has helped guide this process through his service on the Management Council's Strategic Planning Subcommittee.

After Stan's presentation, we will hear brief reports from the chairs of selected Division III committees. We've already heard from Lois DeFleur from the Budget Committee. The reports will summarize the key actions of those committees during the past year and will also identify future areas of emphasis, especially in relationship to the strategic plan.

Joining us are several chairs of various subcommittees. John Harper, director of athletics at Bridgewater State College, who chairs our subcommittee on student-athletic reinstatement; Suzanne Coffey, director of athletics at Bates College, chair of the Interpretations and Legislation Committee; Dick Rasmussen, executive director of the University Athletic Association, who serves on the Management Council and also chairs the Membership Committee; Art Eason, director of athletics, William Paterson College, chair of the Nominating Committee; and Julie Fernandez from Maryville University of St. Louis and chair of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We are also joined by Truman Turnquist, faculty athletics rep at Mount Union College, who's a member of the Management Council and will present a brief report regarding the work of our Association-wide committees. I'd like to ask Stan Caine to begin our strategic planning discussion, please.

Stanley P. Caine (Adrian College): Thank you, Curt. As was already mentioned to you, I think there is a broad familiarity in higher education with the concept of strategic planning. I think that most of you probably have been involved in some way or another with the process of strategic planning on your own campuses.

As members of the Management Council and Presidents Council began to talk about the new governance structure for Division III, we quickly came to the conclusion that strategic planning could be a very important element ensuring the success of this new venture. It's not as if planning has been out of our minds for the last few years. The former Division III Steering Committee and NCAA Council talked about long-range planning a number of times, but it has been an interest that we were never able fully to pursue because of the press of other business. We thought that the implementation of the new structure presented a golden opportunity for us to undertake strategic planning in earnest. The process began at a joint meeting between the Presidents Council and Management Council last March where we began to talk about how we were going to administer this new structure.

The Management Council in its April meeting last year engaged in a half-day strategic planning discussion led by Ron Stratten, who is the NCAA group executive director for educational services. We reported the results of that initial look at strategic planning to the Presidents Council. The Presidents Council members were enthusiastic. They encouraged us to con-

tinue that process and asked us to report the initial results back to the Presidents Council.

As has been mentioned by Lois DeFleur, as the new Budget Committee began its work, it made a very significant recommendation that added importance to the planning process. As you have heard, each year this division will receive a guaranteed minimum percentage of the NCAA revenue stream. It amounts to 3.19 percent of the Association's annual and general operating revenue. That's a lot of money. It is sufficient to pay for all of the current expenses for Division III. But the Budget Committee quickly recognized that there were many potential additional expenses and requests that were on the horizon. If we funded all of the initiatives that we had before us, we recognized that we would overburden our budget allocation from the organization. Therefore, the committee recommended that no new expenditures be entered into until the division had set priorities on how it would like to move and how it would like its additional moneys to be used. This recommendation from the Budget Committee was approved by both the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

The Management Council formed a subcommittee on strategic planning. In August and October, this Strategic Planning Committee reported to the Management Council and the Presidents Council. Those reports were reviewed by both bodies. Drafts were improved and revised into a document that you should have before you. We've left you a draft of the Division III strategic planning document. It's dangerous to give people something to read while you're speaking, but let me go through it quickly.

The preface for the plan makes an important point. This document is not cast in stone. We envision a planning process for this division that is ongoing. The plan will evolve as we continue to consider what our priorities will be and begin to satisfactorily meet some initial objectives that we have developed in this plan. Therefore, we call it a "living document." It will be something we will revisit with you every year.

Secondly, we have included a vision statement that attempts to capture the essence of who we are and what we wish to accomplish in Division III. It has the look of a sentence written by a committee, but I think it does a credible job of trying to set a vision as we look into the future of our division. It is followed by a more extensive mission statement. This mission statement is essentially the same as the Division I philosophy statement that you would find in the NCAA Manual with a few minor revisions. We thought it was important to include the philosophy statement in the plan because it clarifies what we are about as a division. I urge your careful attention to this element of the strategic plan. If you read nothing else, it's a good idea as representatives of Division III to be familiar with the principles that undergird all of our activities. They're included in this document.

A fourth section of this plan describes the annual planning process. We have developed a planning process that we think will maximize the participation of all committees and a broad base of the membership. It will begin in October when we begin to plan for the subsequent academic year. Those discussions will start with a review of the current plan and the identification of priorities by both the Management Council and the Presidents Council. We will then forward these priorities to the Division III and Association-wide committees for their review development.

At the January Convention, we will ask each committee to report to us regarding its activities, including its plan to address the priorities that

fall within its charge. We will also provide the membership with a chance to give some input concerning the plan at that time. During the spring and early summer, the specific committee recommendations will be reviewed by the Management Council and the Presidents Council. Any budgetary items will be reviewed by the Budget Committee as well. We view the summer meetings of the Management Council and the Presidents Council as planning times, in which those two bodies can focus on finalizing the goals, priorities and operations relating to the succeeding year. One of the key features of this approach relates to our committees. This process will directly involve all of our committees in the strategic-planning process and ensure that whatever they're doing is consistent with the overall strategic plan for the division.

The fifth section you have contains the priorities we have identified so far. Presently, student-athlete welfare has been identified as our top priority. You can see that's quite a broad category. It includes issues related to championships, financial aid and health and safety issues. Membership issues are high on our list of things we must address with both memberships and continuing members. Other areas of special importance that we have identified relate to technology, communication, diversity, enhancement of the Division III identity and the implementation of the new governance structure. I want to emphasize this is a three-year process. We have built it into a three-year process. The priorities we have set will extend through the 1999-00 academic year. As we begin to achieve some of these elements, they will be replaced on a rolling three-year basis with new priorities.

There is a sixth section that you don't have called the "operations plan." That spells out specific actions, responsible parties and due dates related to the priorities. We did not share that with you because it's fairly detailed and will be revised as we receive the first round of feedback from the committees. That's still in some stage of development, but I hope that the first five sections that you have give you a pretty good idea of what the planning process is all about.

Let me identify the other members of the Strategic Planning Committee for your information. They include Jim Appleton, Bridget Belgiovine, John Biddiscombe, Lynda Calkins, Walter Johnson, Louise O'Neal and Dick Rasmussen. Feel free to forward any questions or recommendations to any committee members.

We are going to hear from several committees about their work, but we have time for questions or comments. We have a couple of minutes if anyone would like to address any specific issue related to strategic planning. It may not be the hottest issue on your mind at this time, but I think it's a very important process as we move forward.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Let's move forward with committee reports. In late October, a copy of the plan was forwarded to the chairs of every Division I standing committee and to each of our representatives in the Association-wide committees. We are now asking the chairs to report regarding the activities of those groups during the last year as well as to review how the committee might recommend addressing the priorities that we have set in Section 5 as they relate to the responsibilities of that committee.

Please note we will not receive this morning a report from the Championships Committee because we are going to be talking about cham-

pionships and listening to the Championships Committee at some length later this morning and this afternoon. We have not included a report from the Financial Aid and Awards Committee because the work of that committee will be the focus of tomorrow morning's discussion. We already had an opportunity to hear from the Budget Committee and from Lois De Fleur.

INFRACTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

The next committee that we will hear from is the Committee on Infractions and Student-Athlete Reinstatement. That committee has really operated as two subcommittees.

One subcommittee is the Infractions Committee. Our reporter for that particular committee was not able to be with us this morning, so let me just identify the members of that subcommittee. They are: Richard Berman, who is the president of Manhattanville College; Rocco Carzo, who is the director of athletics at Tufts University; Linda Case, director of athletics at SUNY Brockport; Nancy Gray, the associate director of athletics at Case Western Reserve University; and Fred Lacey, who is an attorney. That particular committee met in an orientation session in August, but up to this time we have not had any Division III infractions cases that have been referred to that subcommittee, so they have no further report. I suppose that's good news.

I will now call on John Harper, who chairs the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Subcommittee, for his report.

STUDENT-ATHLETE REINSTATEMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

John C. Harper (Bridgewater State College, Massachusetts): Thank you, President Caine. This will be a very brief report.

The other members of the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Subcommittee are Jo Ann Andregg, associate director of athletics, the University of St. Thomas (Minnesota); Lynda Calkins, whose name you hear a lot around here, director of athletics at Hollins College; Tom Weingartner, director of athletics at the University of Chicago; and Sharon Whittaker, acting director of athletics at Stillman College.

The subcommittee had three in-person meetings in 1997, one of which was an orientation session for the new members. Two were regular meetings with all divisions present. The key issues reviewed by the Division III subcommittee included amateurism and gambling and the increased number of international student-athletes enrolling at Division III institutions.

The subcommittee imposed similar conditions for restoration of eligibility in the form of repayment for international tennis student-athletes who receive prize money based on place-finish. Finally, the subcommittee agreed to sponsor proposed legislation that affects Division III de minimis recruiting and restitution violations.

There are a number of issues that the subcommittee anticipates for future consideration based on the strategic plan. These include amateurism issues and the need to stress consistency among all divisions. The subcommittee also seeks continued study of Bylaw 10.3 modifications as they relate to gambling issues.

The subcommittee reviewed the Division III strategic plan and found three main issues in this document that related to the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Subcommittee. First, is the need to focus on enhancing the Division III identity and educating the public regarding the culture of Division III athletics. Second, the subcommittee seeks to continue to emphasize the need

for continuity in certain areas within the Student-Athlete Reinstatement Subcommittee, but it also recognizes the importance of divisional breakout sessions at its biannual meetings. Finally, the subcommittee asserts that there needs to be balance between the value of expanding Division III opportunities for student-athletes with the overall quality of their experience.

If there are questions regarding the Committee on Student-Athlete Reinstatement, please direct them to members of the subcommittee. Thank you.

Mr. Caine: Next, we will hear a report from the Interpretations and Legislation Committee chaired by Suzanne Coffey.

INTERPRETATIONS AND LEGISLATION COMMITTEE

Suzanne Coffey (Bates College): Thank you. First, let me introduce the members of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee. They are: Carlyle Carter of the Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference; Susan Chapman of Worcester State College; Dennis Collins of the North Coast Athletic Conference; David Jacobs of Whittier College; Beverly Klooster of Calvin College; and our student-athlete representative, Elizabeth Sander from Bryn Mawr College. On behalf of the Division III Committee on Interpretations and Legislation, I offer the following report.

The committee's work began last summer. Our conversations and deliberations have focused on the procedures for the management of legislative and interpretive issues brought forth by the membership and by the NCAA legislative services staff. In addition to our responsibilities for reviewing legislation and for interpreting bylaws, the committee has discussed at length the deregulation of the Division III Manual. We have begun this deliberative process by examining Bylaws 10 through 17, including legislation dealing with ethical conduct, the conduct in employment of athletics personnel, amateurism, recruiting, eligibility, financial aid awards and benefits, and playing and practice seasons. Our work to deregulate will be carried out in two distinct phases. During the first phase, we will make less cumbersome the language of the bylaws by removing references to Divisions I and II from the Division III Manual. In Phase 2, legislation that does not apply directly in practice or in theory to Division III will be recommended for deletion. Our objective in this work is to respect the strategic plan by carrying out the wishes of the Division III membership through the deregulation of our operative bylaws.

The task is complex, but I'm pleased and indeed fortunate to be working with this very capable group of committee colleagues in this effort. This concludes the report of the Committee on Interpretations and Legislation. Thank you.

Mr. Caine: Thanks, Suzanne. The next committee to report is the Membership Committee, Dick Rasmussen.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): I'd like to begin by introducing the members of the Membership Committee. They include: Kitty Baird from Centre College; Howard Burnett from Washington and Jefferson College; Gordon Collins of the College of Wooster; Carol Fritz from Western Maryland College; Marcia Kierscht from Stephens College; Marilyn Skrivseth from the University of Wisconsin, Eau Claire; Charlie Titus from the University of Massachusetts, Boston; and Michael Walsh from Washington and Lee University.

The makeup of our committee includes two presidents, one faculty athletics representative, one conference executive, three athletics directors and two senior woman administrators. This mix of perspectives has been particularly helpful to the committee as we've moved ahead. I'd like to acknowledge the involvement of our two presidents in the work of the committee. That involvement has been very helpful as we moved ahead with many of the issues that we're beginning to take up.

The charge of the Membership Committee, as taken from the legislation that established our committee, is to review issues related to the Division III membership, including issues and educational efforts affecting provisional and continuing members. Toward that end, the committee monitors and recommends actions on new member applications. It reviews and recommends action to the Management Council on waiver applications for things like sports sponsorship, waivers based on male/female enrollment ratios and geographical waivers where appropriate.

The committee also reviews the progress of provisional members in meeting their sports sponsorship, scheduling, financial aid and other requirements during the provisional membership period. The committee, consistent with that charge, also suggests ways of enhancing the educational process and promoting compliance with our bylaws for both new members and current members.

I'd also like to acknowledge the benefits that this committee has derived from the work of the membership subcommittee of the Division III Restructuring Task Force. That group over the last two years paid a lot of attention to these issues and made a number of recommendations that have guided us and given us good direction as we've begun our work. I'd like to acknowledge the work that they did and thank them for the benefits that we've gained by moving forward with their suggestions.

To date, the committee has met three times. We had an in-person meeting this summer. We met by conference call twice this fall. We reviewed in detail the status to date of about 40 provisional members and made recommendations to the Management Council regarding their status in the process. Some of those recommendations have included a recommendation to continue their status and move them from one year to the next in the process. There were some recommendations regarding the possible termination of the provisional membership status. Some of those modifications, based on additional information that came up in that process, were modified and consistent with our bylaws and some issues that were raised, a number of the provisional members were asked to complete an additional year of provisional membership to ensure that they were in complete compliance with all of our bylaws for a two-year period.

One of the things we did as a result of that process was to schedule a meeting with a number of our provisional members this fall to review the expectations and to clarify some issues regarding our bylaws and our expectations in a number of areas, particularly scheduling and financial aid legislation.

The committee has worked at establishing procedures for how we will operate with regard to the evaluation of institutions during the provisional membership period. We've tried to be sure that we make clear to new institutions what our expectations of them are. When there's difficulty in the review process, we provide institutions with an adequate opportunity to respond. Between the period in which we made some recommendations to the Management Council and the time that the Management Council took

their actions, institutions had an opportunity to be apprised of those recommendations and to respond to them in a timely fashion.

We made recommendations regarding the modification of some of our bylaws to ensure that institutions receive adequate and due notice with regard to pending actions. We've recommended some changes through non-controversial legislation to clarify some issues related to the definition of conference membership and what constitutes a conference and the role of provisional members within existing conferences. This morning, we voted upon legislation regarding the reclassification of institutions from Divisions I and II into Division III. We've also spent a great deal of time reviewing and we hope strengthening the institutional self-study guide that's currently in use by our membership and by provisional members. We've added a couple of sections to that dealing with sportsmanship and ethical conduct and also sports medicine. We really made an effort to link that exercise to our divisional philosophy. We tried to ensure that institutions really engage our philosophy as they go through that and also retain the emphasis on self-education in that process rather than making it a policing process.

The things we have on our agenda as we move forward include a number of issues. One is completing the ISSG revisions, giving better definition to the new membership process and procedures, making sure that they're clear, understandable and also effective both for applicant members and also in serving the interests of existing members. We will be looking at the development of workshops for new members. Some of the suggestions for that came out of our meeting with provisional members this fall. We're looking at meetings both at the Convention and possibly at sites other than the Convention to help new members in their efforts to come into our division. We will also be looking at workshops around the Convention for our active members to help them in complying with the bylaws, understanding our rules and applying them.

The Executive Committee of the Association has asked us to review the dues structure and several issues related to NCAA dues for individual institutions and conferences. That request has been made of all three divisions. We also will be looking at the appropriateness and the desirability of developing some sort of self-study guide that might be of use for conferences as an educational tool in their efforts. The final item on our agenda is a review of our divisional-scheduling requirements and whether those scheduling requirements, particularly in football and men's and women's basketball, should be extended to other sports or whether they should be eliminated entirely.

The committee members appreciate the support of the Management Council and the Presidents Council. We appreciate your support. We certainly welcome any suggestions that you may have. Thank you very much.

Mr. Caine: Thank you, Dick. We will next hear from the Nominating Committee. Art Eason has that report.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): Thank you. The work of the Nominating Committee was to make recommendations for nominations to the NCAA Division III membership. The recommendations went to the Management Council and to the Presidents Council.

During the past year, we did our work in four in-person meetings. We had five conference calls. This year, there will be a meeting in February to make recommendations for appointments. In February, a meeting will be held for

appointments that will take place in September 1998. We will meet in August to make recommendations for appointments beginning in January 1999. There also will be an undetermined number of conference calls to fill interim vacancies.

Some of the key issues that we looked at this year were the following: inclusion of more independent institutions in the committee structure; balancing of the need to include new and experienced individuals in the structure; compliance with new legislative requirements for committees, including the diversity requirement, the conference repeat rule and the administrator/coach rule on sports committees; and creating a more open and more proactive committee-appointment process.

We designated members of the Nominating Committee to serve as liaisons with specific geographical regions and constituencies and found that to be very helpful in increasing the communication regarding the committee structure within Division III.

For 1998, some of the anticipated and ongoing issues will be as follows: encouragement of Division III members to respond to calls for nominations; encouraging individual initiative to self-nominate and to get into the candidates' pool; the continued need for additional nominees to increase diversity; evaluation of meeting the legislative requirements; and ongoing notification of individuals not appointed to committees.

We talked before about the strategic plan. The strategic plan has several implications regarding the Nominating Committee. One of them is enhancing communication. We hope to increase personal contact to the Division III membership by members of the Nominating Committee regularly during the annual Convention. We also will publish within *The NCAA News* the chart showing what people are on what committees and what conferences are represented.

We will annually solicit input from committee chairs regarding specific qualifications and skills that are required of new appointees. We will increase the pool of nominees by reviewing the committee vacancy placement in *The NCAA News* and through electronic media and messaging. I would like to thank John Schael of Washington University for coming up with a server list. It was very important and helped a lot in making some appointments. We're also creating a nomination database. Once nominated, a nominee remains active in the pool of consideration for one year. It is anticipated that this database will be up and running by March 1998. The database will make it possible to easily communicate with all nominees, those selected and those not.

Another goal of the strategic plan that affects us directly is the implementation of the governance process. For the year 2000-01, we will evaluate the committee legislation and the impact on the division of the conference repeat rule and the administrator/coach rule. Has the legislation created diversity? Has it opened up the committee structure?

At this point, I would like to introduce the members of our committee to you. First of all, Bridget Belgiovine. Bridget is the former athletics director at the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; Robert G. Bottoms, president of DePauw University; Edward G. Coll Jr., president of Alfred University; Marjorie Giles, faculty representative, Central College (Iowa); Porter Miller, director of athletics, Earlham College; Louise O'Neal, director of athletics, Wellesley College; Jenefer Shillingford, director of athletics, Bryn Mawr College. Along with these members, there are two outgoing members—Bridget

and Porter. Replacing them will be Robert Bonn, director of athletics, Carthage College; and Valerie Cushman, director of athletics, Randolph-Macon Woman's College. At this time, I would like to give a special thanks to Julie Quickel, our liaison with the NCAA staff. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. Caine: Thank you, Art. One of the things that we're especially proud of in Division III is the good work that is done by our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. We are, I think you should recognize, the only one of the three divisions that has two student-athletes as voting members of our Management Council. The contributions of Kerry and Cris we especially appreciate at that level, but we appreciate the work of all of the students in this regard.

These are people who are central to all of the concerns that we talk about on a daily basis. I am especially pleased to introduce the chair of the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, Julie Fernandez, who will offer a report on behalf of that committee. Julie.

STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Julie Fernandez (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Maryville University of St. Louis): Thank you. Our committee is comprised of 24 members—four from each of four regions and eight at-large members.

I would like to introduce them to you now. From Region 1: Randi Borgen, Middlebury College; Brendan Cooney, Gordon College; Heather Gilmour, University of Southern Maine; and Cris Pellegrino, Tufts University. From Region 2: Greg Belinfanti, New York University; Robert Morrissey, Vassar College; Greg Spotti, Waynesburg College; and Margaret Trainor, Rosemont College. From Region 3: Katelin Chmielinski, Sweet Briar College; Mike Hammond, Centre College; Sara Lehman, Bluffton College; and as our Management Council representative, Maureen Hager, Allegheny College. Region 4: myself; Andrew Hedden from Carleton College; Amy Huchthausen from University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; and Chris Wilson from Nebraska Wesleyan University. The at-large members include: Spencer Cox from Central College (Iowa); Becky Crews from Trinity University; Jessica Droste from Haverford College; Dana Feltz from William Paterson College; Kerry Gotham from Nazareth College; Brandon Graham from Hope College; Shawn McNamara from Worcester State College; and Maricella Ocegueda from the University of California, San Diego. Bridget Belgiovine has also served on our committee as a Management Council representative. We've also had three NCAA staff assisting with our committee. Those include Mira Colman, Karl Hicks and Tonya Barry.

Our committee met in Denver July 26 and 27, at which time we welcomed our new members, developed our strategic plan and began preparations for this Convention. Since that time, we have continued our communication via fax, e-mail and telephone conference.

Some key issues that our committee identified during our strategic planning session include the following: to encourage and assist in the establishment of campus SAACs for those Division III institutions that do not currently have one in operation; to increase communication with Division III campus SAACs in order to strengthen such groups and to create further awareness of student-athlete welfare issues at that level; and to ensure that a Division III SAAC representative be included on the Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

In addition, the key issues that we have identified that we feel we will address in the future have all been included in the Division III strategic plan.

Those are as follows: student-athlete welfare issues, including health and safety; championships; financial aid issues; and enhancement of communication from the campus level to the conference level and up to the national level and vice-versa so that we may communicate back to the campus level our activities with internal and external organizations.

We also hope to continue to communicate with the Division I and Division II National Student-Athlete Advisory Committees. With our communications, we hope to get a Web page up and running this spring so that all the campuses, your student-athletes, can access the activities that go on in our committee. In addition, we frequently publish articles in *The NCAA News*.

We want to continue to educate those members in the new structure. As we all know, it can at times be confusing. We also wish to promote the image of the Division III student-athlete by encouraging and supporting participation in national student-athlete day activities and by participating in community outreach programs.

In addition, we are encouraged by the NCAA Foundation's support of the leadership conference. As you know, the first leadership conference was held in Orlando last May. They are planning to again hold it in Orlando this May. We're encouraged that 60 additional Division III institutions are going to have the opportunity to send their student-athletes to this conference. We encourage that all of you take advantage of the CHAMPS/Life Skills program as that is one way that you can ensure that your student-athletes will have the opportunity to participate in this great event. The last issue is Title IX issues.

In closing, I would like to thank the presidents, athletics directors, faculty administrators and the NCAA staff for all the work you have done that has contributed to our development, not only as students and as athletes, but as people. We thank you for the opportunity to participate. (Applause)

Mr. Caine: Thank you, Julie, for that good report. As you know, we not only have our division-specific committees, but we have representation on various Association-wide committees.

We do not intend this morning to hear oral reports from our representatives on those Association-wide committees, but we do ask Truman Turnquist, who is a member of the Division III Management Council, to say a few words about those groups and our participation on those committees. Truman.

ASSOCIATION-WIDE COMMITTEES

Truman D. Turnquist (Mount Union College): Thank you, Stan. Along with the document regarding the Division III strategic plan, you should have received a document that contains reports from seven Association-wide committees.

In addition to the committees that are listed on your report, other Association-wide committees exist, but we felt that these were the key committees to touch on for our purposes today. The reports are from Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, Minority Opportunities and Interests, National Youth Sports Program, Olympic Sports Liaison, Postgraduate Scholarship, Research and Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct Committees. The Committee on Women's Athletics is not on the list because we have scheduled a separate discussion forum on Title IX and gender equity later this afternoon.

We asked at this meeting that these committees identify their membership, report on their recent activities and identify major issues they see on

the horizon, especially as they relate to issues that appear in the Division III strategic plan. The reports are the result of that request. Some of the reports are more responsive than others, but we believe that all of the information is valuable to us.

I don't intend to review this information, but if you have questions, I encourage you to contact the Division III representative serving on that committee. You can also contact the national staff. They will try to answer your questions or find someone who can answer your question.

Finally, I would like to remind you how the Association-wide committees work in the new governance structure. First, keep in mind that each committee contains representatives from all three divisions. As far as committee recommendations are concerned, they are forwarded separately to each of the divisional governance structures. In Division III, those recommendations go first to the Management Council and then to our Presidents Council. If each division acts on the committee's recommendations consistently, that's the end of the process. If the divisions act differently, however, the issue can be forwarded to the Executive Committee for resolution. This process means that communication between the divisions is critical.

The overall effectiveness of this process remains to be seen. Certainly, it is not perfect. We intend to evaluate how the process is working during the next few years as part of our strategic plan. Thank you very much.

Mr. Caine (Adrian College): If anyone has comments or questions of a general kind they would like to address with regard to planning and committee activities, this would be the time to do it. I encourage all of you to participate in this process in various ways. Please share your views with the appropriate committees. Please express your willingness to serve on these committees. We need a very broad base of participation in order to make this process work. Let me close by thanking those who gave the reports today and all of those who are participating on committees and making the Division III structure effective now and into the future. Thank you to everyone for your service and for your attention to these reports. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. McCray: Many thanks, Stan, to you and these volunteers for contributing significantly to the progress of restructuring. We appreciate it immensely. I'm sure in the long run it will serve us well.

It is now time to begin our championships discussion session. I'm aware from hallway conversation that many of you have been looking forward to this discussion. I would like to introduce President Jim Appleton of the University of Redlands. Jim has extensive experience in our governance structure, as I think many of you know, serving formally over seven years with the organization, including serving as the cochair of the Division III Restructuring Task Force as well as being a former member of the Presidents Commission. For the past year, Jim has served on the Management Council. He brings a unique and long-term perspective to these issues and I believe a clear understanding to our championships discussion topics. Jim, may I turn the podium over to you?

CHAMPIONSHIPS FORUM

James R. Appleton (University of Redlands): It's terrific we've been efficient with our business. We have the rest of the morning to talk about these important topics.

More than five years ago, we began conversations about restructuring the NCAA. At last year's Convention, we approved the federated structure. This

year, we have enjoyed the opportunity and have worked hard to implement this restructuring, to develop a set of one- to three-year priorities and to expand championship opportunities in many sports. We have adopted a set of principles that emphasize in-season play and access equivalency across sports to championship opportunities. Of course, as is noted in our strategic plan, there are a number of matters that can be considered as unfinished business.

We will give attention to two of these matters this morning. Both are very important to our entire membership. One is an equitable arrangement that meets our Division III philosophy for postseason opportunities for football. The second issue pertains to automatic qualifiers and how access to all team-sport championships is to be determined. For the remainder of the morning, we intend to provide a lot of information to bring us up to date so we're all on a level playing field with regard to these matters and what has transpired to date. This afternoon, Dan Bridges will provide time for discussion and any recommendations that you wish to have considered as a result of the discussion of these two topics. I think it is very important for me to note at the outset that both of these topics will be decided not by legislative action or by a vote of the membership, but by your representatives on the football committee, the Championships Committee, the Management Council and ultimately the Presidents Council. The discussion will take into account our discussion, our principles, the guidelines we've established, and then it will be on the shoulders of the Presidents Council to ultimately make the decision on these two topics on our behalf. To introduce the first of these two topics, football championships, it's very clear that the membership is in favor of increased opportunity in championships in football. Several models have been considered by the football and Championships Committees and by the Management Council at the behest of the Presidents Council.

The membership has responded to surveys regarding this matter. To date, two options have been selected for further consideration and possible implementation. This does not necessarily mean that these are the only possibilities. But these are clearly the ones that have been given the greatest consideration for implementation by the Presidents Council. As I mentioned this morning, we will primarily be in a presentation mode to lay the groundwork for better conversation this afternoon. John Biddiscombe, director of athletics, Wesleyan College, a member of the Division III Championships Committee and Management Council, will lead us off.

Then, in order, Steve Bamford, director of athletics, Plymouth State College, chair of the football committee; Ray Smith, director of athletics, Hope College, member of the football committee; and Larry Schiner, director of athletics, Jersey City State College, member of the Championships Committee.

It is our objective to review both options and get some feedback about the surveys. We then will move to some discussion or presentation about automatic qualifiers. It is likely that we will have a bit of time late in the morning to begin our conversation, but I want to make sure you know this afternoon is going to be wide open for conversation.

John, if you would lead us off, our other colleagues will continue on the football question.

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you, Jim. I have been asked to provide some comments about the two options to increase access to the Division III postseason football playoffs. I thought it would be helpful to speak briefly about the process that the Division III Cham-

pionship Committee and the Division III Football Committee used in developing the options that are being presented to the delegates this morning.

Before I get into the details of the options, I want to outline the process for you. Expanding championship opportunities for Division III football began with a commitment from the Division III Presidents Council in recognizing the need to increase with full funding the number of football teams qualifying for postseason competition. The presidents charged the Division III Management Council with the responsibility of recommending a plan for championship enhancement. The Management Council in turn instructed the Division III Championships Committee to provide the oversight in developing a proposal or proposals for review. Of course, the Championships Committee then turned to the football committee as the group that would develop specific options for consideration.

Before I get to the specific options that the football committee has developed, I want to say how impressed I was with the responsiveness of this committee. Led by their very able chair, Steve Bamford, the athletics director at Plymouth State College who you will hear from in a moment, the committee listened well to the assignment provided to it by the Championships Committee. Although not always in total agreement with the direction provided by the Championships Committee, this group worked hard in coming up with various options that could be brought forward for consideration. As a first response, the football committee provided seven different and distinct proposals that met the guidelines set by the Championships Committee. This array of options included postseason play toward a national championship and regional team tournaments.

From that extensive list, the Championships Committee selected three options and asked the football committee to submit the options over the summer to the football-playing membership. The membership responded by favoring two of the three options. They are the ones that we will review this morning.

The first option provides for 24 teams. Two separate brackets are created. The 16-team bracket is similar to the current playoff structure—four teams from each region play to crown a regional champion and the four regional champions continue through to a national championship game. The other tournament, a national invitational tournament, includes two additional teams from each region. These teams play through until a national invitational champion is crowned. I won't get into the details on the number of weeks and the format. I will let the next speaker inform you about that process.

Option No. 2 also provides for 24 teams. The 16-team bracket is similar to the current playoff structure that I've just outlined. However, four invitational bowls would invite two additional teams from each region for a one-game postseason event. These four bowls would be held on the campus of the higher-ranked team. Obviously, not all of the details have been worked out on the selection process. However, I think that the football committee can give you an idea of how that would work. Therefore, I'd like to turn over the microphone to Steve Bamford. Steve.

Stephen R. Bamford (Plymouth State College): Thank you very much, John. At the outset, I promise to be brief since most of the membership is very familiar with both of the options currently under consideration.

Option No. 1, which I will describe, is most commonly referred to as the national invitational tournament option. Twenty-four teams are initially

selected to participate in NCAA postseason play. Two separate tournament brackets are created in this model—a 16-team bracket and an eight-team bracket. The 16-team tournament format is the same model that we currently use in Division III football to crown a national champion. In this format, the top four teams from each of four regions around the country play through a four-week playoff structure, culminating on the final Saturday with the Stagg Bowl for the national championship in Division III.

The second tournament bracket, the national invitational tournament, is analogous to the National Invitational Tournament in Division I basketball. It's a satellite tournament. It's an eight-team field comprised of the fifth- and sixth-ranked teams from each of the four regions of the country. In the first round of the invitational format, the No. 5-ranked team in each region hosts the No. 6-ranked team in that region. The four regional winners advance to the second round at campus sites to be determined in accordance with a rotational system to ensure fairness and equity across the four regions over a four-year time period. In the third and final round of the invitational model, the two semifinal winners would compete in the national invitational championship game on the campus of one of the participating schools.

In a nutshell, that is a capsule synopsis of Option No. 1, the national invitational model, which was the most popular of the three options presented to the membership last fall. Forty-eight percent of the membership that responded favored this option. It is important to note and I urge the membership to recognize that while the invitational model does provide increased access to NCAA postseason play for eight additional teams, it does not, and I repeat does not, provide bracket expansion; nor does it increase access for additional teams to compete for a true national championship at the Stagg Bowl in the fourth week of that tournament process.

In essence, the format maintains the status quo with respect to the current 16-team national championship bracket while adding eight more teams to a separate satellite tournament. It is also important to note that this model and the option that will be described by Ray Smith do not impact the current 11-week regular-season schedule as it now exists.

After lunch, I'll be happy to field any questions about this model as well as the regional bowl concept, which my committee colleague, Ray Smith, will describe in a few minutes. In closing, I want to thank you very much for your consideration and support of our committee's recommendations for increasing access to NCAA postseason play in Division III football. Thank you.

Raymond E. Smith (Hope College): It's always difficult to follow Steve Bamford, but I'll do the best job that I can. Steve has asked me to speak on the one-game regional bowl format. As has been explained, the regional game would be played at the home site of the highest-seeded team.

In the initial survey of the Division III football coaches in September, the one-game format received support from 37 percent of the head football coaches in the country. Last week in Dallas at the American Football Coaches Association Division III football meeting, the coaches, after several months of reflection, voted the one-game regional format as their choice for teams not in the championship bracket. There are some pluses for the one-game format. One is a reward for a great season. Under the current structure, many outstanding teams have not been selected for postseason play. Reason No. 2, it provides an opportunity to engage in postseason play against a quality regional opponent. It recognizes your team as one of the top-24 teams in

the country. Certainly, this recognition could be used appropriately in recruiting athletes for the next school year.

Regarding wins and losses, which are uppermost in the minds of coaches, in the eight-team three-game track, only one team ends up winning its last game. In the regional format, four teams end their season on a winning note. This can also be used for recruiting purposes. How does this one game impact coaches and players? I would like to assume Hope College is structured like most Division III schools that play football. Three of our nine coaches are full-time teachers and coaches. The other six are part-time or volunteers who help coach because they love the sport of football and want to be associated with the football program.

For example, one of our full-time part-time coaches is a dentist in a near-by town. Another one of our full-time part-time coaches is a Presbyterian minister in town. You get the idea that we're a lot like most of you. Given the other responsibilities of these nine coaches, one game is much more palatable with the coaching staff at least at Hope College. In regard to the student-athlete, time is our student-athletes' most precious commodity. Again, one week versus a three-week track makes more sense when your team is not in the hunt for a national championship.

Let's talk about participation. Division III is known as the division that advocates participation. During the regular season at Hope College, we dress everyone for our home games. Currently in Division III, 48 players are allowed to dress for a postseason Division III football game. If this format was in place the past season and if Hope was good enough to qualify for postseason play, it would have allowed only 40 percent of our squad of 120 players to dress for the game. Here's a thought for the membership that I'm not sure Steve Bamford will appreciate. If the membership votes for one game versus three games, it would save the NCAA a bundle of money. I would like to see this extra money used to allow more football players to dress for participation in postseason play.

The last thing I would like to comment on is the weather factor. In our part of the country, Holland, Michigan, the weather in late November can be questionable at best or just plain awful. Given all these reasons, I would like the membership to strongly consider the one-game regional bowl option as the best track for our division.

Lawrence R. Schiner (Jersey City State College): My part in this presentation is to share with you some of the important issues identified by the Championships Committee from survey feedback, general commentary and football committee input on championship bracket expansion. We provide this information as food for thought and hope these issues will stimulate your participation in this afternoon's discussion. It should be noted that of the 216 institutions sponsoring football, 151 returned the survey. That is a 70-percent response rate, which for any survey is extremely high.

One hundred and thirty-nine institutions supported the expansion of the championship. Twelve did not. Forty-eight percent of the respondents selected Option No. 1 as their first choice. Thirty-five percent selected Option No. 2 as their first choice, and 16 percent selected Option No. 3. One of the main issues identified to the Championships Committee is that the format of the championship should be linked to the concept of access for all football-playing institutions, especially for conference champions and independents, as well as a participation ratio that's comparable to other team sports.

As you may be aware, the participation ratio with the 16-team bracket is

one berth per 13.5 schools. With a 24-team bracket, it would be one berth per nine schools, which falls within the 1-to-8, 1-to-12 range for all other team sports. Another issue is if bracket expansion does not take place now, the opportunity may be lost. According to the survey results, 88 percent of the respondents would like to see the expansion effective for the 1998 season.

There is also a feeling that Options No. 1 and 2 are not perceived as true bracket expansion by many football coaches, athletics directors and conference commissioners. Additionally, there is a concern that the goal of bracket expansion not only should be to increase participation, but also to retain the integrity of the national championship. Therefore, all teams selected to participate should have an equal opportunity for the national championship, as is the case with the other sports.

It seems that the key issue for the football-playing institutions is having the opportunity to revisit the 24-team, five-week model that allows all teams a chance to compete for the national championship. Feedback received by the Championships Committee indicated that this model was the unanimous choice of both the Division III Football Committee and the coaches in attendance at the Division III meeting of the American Football Coaches Association held in Dallas January 4. It was also noted to the Championships Committee that football is the only sport played by NCAA Division III members that does not have the opportunity to utilize the maximum number of weeks permitted for participation under the 21-week playing- and practice-season bylaw. Increasing the championship by one additional week would still permit it to be conducted well within the 21-week regulation.

The Championships Committee anticipates that an informative and constructive discussion will take place this afternoon, enabling the committee, the Management Council and the Presidents Council to have a more comprehensive understanding and awareness of the membership's position on this issue. Certainly, your input will guide the committee in its future discussions and recommendations regarding football-bracket expansion. We look forward to hearing your comments at this afternoon's session. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: Thank you and your colleagues, Larry, for those comments. It's very difficult not to pause immediately and begin some conversation about the two options that have been presented. Larry commented as well about the information from the coaches' organization. But I want us to stay on the plan and have a bit more presentation on an issue and opportunity that by shorthand we call automatic qualifiers and the interest we have in providing postseason play for conference champions in team sports and providing equitable access for independent institutions. Colleagues will present information about these issues and then we will be able to begin some conversation. Walter Johnson, director of athletics, North Central College, and Championships Committee and Management Council member, and Sheila Wallace Kovalchik, commissioner of the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and member of the Championships Committee, will present information that will pave the way for further discussion. Walter, if you'd start.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): Before I get started, I have to do something. I'm from Illinois. Illinois is in such close proximity to Wisconsin, that if I don't pay homage to the cheeseheads winning, they might send Illinois bad cheese. So for all you cheeseheads, please bring us good cheese to Illinois. There's another story I could tell, but I won't.

In reading the recent issue of the Intercollegiate Athletic Forum, Al Van Why writes: "The fundamental question with automatic qualification is

should winning your conference championship guarantee you automatic access to national championship play?" The Presidents and Management Councils and Championships Committee were all asked to investigate and develop a plan that would guarantee automatic qualification to all qualifying conferences in our team-sports championships. We saw this to be one of the key issues facing this organization as we work through the details inherent in the new structure of the Association. The issue of access is not new, nor are there ready-made solutions to address the uniqueness of every sport, conference and situation.

With that knowledge in hand, the Championships Committee accepted the challenge to find an equitable solution to this important issue. The Championships Committee first set out to establish a goal that was consistent with the Division III philosophy and the principle of competitive equity, as set forth in the Division III Manual. Article 2.10 states: "The structure and programs of the Association and the activities of its members shall promote opportunity for equity and competition to assure that individual student-athletes and institutions will not be prevented unfairly from achieving the benefits inherent in participation in intercollegiate athletics." The mission statement, Point 10 states: "Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach a high level of athletics performance, which may include opportunity for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities."

Our first order of business in developing a goal was to find a base point of general agreement. The Championships Committee began its work by looking at the existing brackets to develop a set of standards that would result in at least 50 percent of all playoff spots going to automatic qualifiers. With 50 percent as a minimum starting point, we moved forward in an attempt to include all team-sport conference champions in the NCAA postseason experience. It became pretty clear that 50 percent would not be enough when we worked our way around the room and found that there weren't a lot of Championships Committee members who were willing to volunteer their potential conference bid in an effort to leave us at about 50 percent, so we realized that we had to go a step further. Thus, finding a way to include all who met a set of base requirements was definitely the emphasis. The goal was then established as follows: To provide access to championship opportunities for conference champions in all team sports and equitable access for independent institutions.

Each of you received a handout with that stated on it. I have to stop at this point and indicate that this is a work in progress. It's a draft. We're here to make sure that we get your input as we move forward in this process. There's nothing here that's set in stone. These are ideas. These are concepts. We're hoping that we can at least provide some direction. Membership feedback, thoughts and ideas will help move this process forward.

Next, we formed a set of guiding principles that would provide the framework for the rest of the championship process. You should have that information in front of you. The first principle dealt with conference qualifications; the second, proportional berths for independents; the third, at-large berths for conferences and independents, and the fourth, multiregional conferences.

The next step was to put together a set of requirements. In the requirements I've paraphrased, the 7-and-7 rule plus 14, basically says that you must have at least seven members who sponsor the sport on a varsity level and at least seven members who are eligible for championship participation

to determine your inclusion in the process. There is a two-consecutive-year rule for conducting competition, with the idea that waivers could be granted. Also included is the conference 3-plus-3 sports sponsorship rule, with independents having to meet the minimum standards of membership; competition qualification; dates; cancellation process; the tie-breaker system; conference subdivision qualification; NCAA eligibility compliance; conference championships, in which champions must compete in the postseason; and, finally, one conference membership for qualification.

The details of each one of these are written out. Again, these are ideas, concepts. We worked through a number of different ideas of getting to some of these. In some of these areas, we used percentages. In some, we took current legislation and tried to adopt qualifications that would fit the legislation, ultimately with the idea that we would get further feedback from the membership so that as we move forward in this process, we would have as much information as possible so that at the end we have at least attempted to address all of the concerns of the membership. There are concerns about smaller conferences versus larger conferences. There are concerns about strength of schedule and strength of league. Those are all subjective issues that in some way we possibly could include. We tried to get to the most objective point possible to begin with, and that's what we are attempting to present to you today.

Mr. Appleton: Before Sheila continues, I want to make sure it's clear that the football issue, in terms of access, that the number of teams for postseason play is a single topic. The automatic-qualifier matter applies to all team sports. It is a complementary matter because one will affect the other to some degree in football, but I want to make sure it's clear to our total membership that the point that we're discussing now does apply to all team sports in Division III. Furthermore, the guiding principles before you have been approved. The details of that have not. Thirdly, while it would be the desire of the Management Council and the Presidents Council to come to some change and conclusion regarding the football championship question for implementation this coming fall, the matter of automatic qualifiers has just begun, and it is clear that might take through the following year to continue that debate and dialogue.

I hope that is a good point of clarification. It comes from Bridget, who whispered into my left ear. Sheila, if you would continue, please.

Sheila Wallace-Kovalchik (Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association): My job is to give you a synopsis of the feedback that the Championships Committee received. Unlike football, our response was not as high, but we trust that's not an indication of your level of interest in the topic.

We only had 26 member colleges that sent back responses and nine conferences, but from that information and from further discussions, we've developed 11 questions that are to be—no pun intended—food for thought over lunch. Please note that there are copies of these questions on the back table. Please pick those up so you have them in front of you.

Those 11 questions that reflect concerns and issues brought to our attention include: 1. Which is more important, guaranteed access for conference champions or access for the most competitive teams in a region? 2. Do the principles place too much emphasis on conference affiliation? Will conferences be pressured to take new members or will independents be driven to join a conference? 3. Since primary emphasis for selection is based on conference and regional competition, should the at-large berths be predeter-

mined on a regional basis? If not, how should results from spring trips for sports like baseball and softball be considered? 4. Is it valid to require conferences seeking automatic qualification to sponsor three men's sports and three women's sports? Should existing single-sport conferences receive an exemption to the requirement? 5. Should the minimum automatic-qualification requirements for all sports be consistent? 6. Once the automatics are determined, should the remaining independent institutions and members of conferences not receiving an automatic berth be considered in one pool for the selection or at large? 7. What impact would the principles have on regular-season scheduling? 8. What impact could the principles have on season-ending conference tournaments? 9. Should conferences with 14 or more members be permitted to have more than one automatic berth? 10. Should there be a limit on the number of institutions from the same conference that may be selected for the championship? 11. On what basis (e.g., annual, every three years), should institutions who are members of more than one conference declare which conference they wish to be affiliated with for automatic-qualifying purposes? Would the declaration have to be the same for all sports?

These may not reflect all of the issues, but we hope that these are a beginning for discussions with you.

Mr. Appleton: It is clear that the membership would like to get closer to the percentages we use in other sports for football for some postseason opportunity. It has been stated by both the membership and the leadership. We have tried this morning to provide in addition to written materials and comment about these matters.

I think it would be to our advantage to give you the opportunity to begin to comment as you wish about the first of these two important discussion topics. I would like to entertain the opportunity for people to comment in any way they wish about these respective topics, but hopefully with emphasis on the football question.

Richard A. Kaiser (Olivet College): I would like someone from the Management Council to please explain why they chose to originally say to the football committee that it couldn't use five weeks, much like the opportunities in other sports. Why was it held to four weeks when, in reality, we now know that in the expansion opportunities to 24 teams, it really isn't expansion per se to a national championship?

Mr. Appleton: In our present organization, policy is determined by the Presidents Council. Even though the Management Council was active in establishing the principles and certainly engaged in this conversation, this ultimately moved to the Presidents Council for determination. I would like to ask a member of the Presidents Council to comment.

John DiBiaggio (Tufts University): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. The Presidents Council yesterday voted overwhelmingly to reiterate its strong support for the principle that no postseason championship tournament in any sport exceed four weeks. Therefore, the Presidents Council would anticipate that all the individual sports committees, the Championships Committee and the Management Council would plan their formats in accordance with this important principle.

Mr. Appleton: John, to just follow up on what I think was the intent of that question, you might wish to develop some comment of rationale in addition to what's been stated.

Mr. DiBiaggio: Members of the Presidents Council recognize that football is unique in that only one contest can be held per week. This is not

unprecedented. In Division I, where I spent most of my career, there are 64 teams that participate in the basketball tournament, but there's no attempt to replicate that in football. More importantly, I believe Division III has not been and should not become primarily about national championships. Rather, it's about assuring that our students have the proper environment to develop themselves athletically and have an appropriate academic experience. Extending the season to this degree I think would impact negatively upon that experience.

Gary F. Karner (Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I think we all agree that the goal of this process is to increase postseason opportunities for football. I think the challenge to that is to provide what we could consider a meaningful experience. I would suggest to you that the two options that have been considered to date, while increasing postseason opportunities under the guise of a national invitational tournament or what some people are already calling a "non-invitational tournament," would not increase the opportunities because we would be missing out on the opportunity to compete for the national championship, so it is not truly an increase in championship opportunities. The option that was presented is new to many of us. I think it not only meets the goal that we've set for ourselves of increasing championship opportunities, but it also makes it a meaningful experience for our student-athletes. With all due respect to President DiBiaggio, we'd be talking about increasing the current playoff structure by one week, which would involve only two teams. That seems to be a minimal cost. If you want to consider cost, provide 24 teams an opportunity to compete for the national championship. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Appleton: It may be useful or instructive to differentiate to some degree between postseason play and championship opportunity. That is a debate that ought to be held within Division III. Those might be defined in a single way, but in many minds they're defined differently. Postseason play and championship play are not always concurrent ideas or similar ideas. I'm not stating a position about that, but it is useful in this dialogue for people to comment about that or to reflect on that as we think of opportunities for our athletes.

John Van Why (Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference): I'm a member of the Division III Football Committee. With all due respect to the Presidents Council, I think the membership has indicated by its poll last summer that it is more interested in national championships than regional championships. I also would like to address the fact that I would hope that everyone supports equity in all sports. If you do support equity in all sports, then you can't be selective in which sport you choose to deny that equity.

I don't have any great words of wisdom today, but I want to visit for a moment about equity and integrity. If you support equity for all sports, then you have to realize that football does not attain that equity at this time because of the two proposals that are on the table.

I rise to support the five-week plan selected in a unanimous decision of the football committee. I want to share a couple thoughts in regard to equity. I would like you to note the uniqueness of football because of what the president of Tufts University indicated—we are allowed only one contest per week. Other sports can play more than one contest per week because of the uniqueness of their sports. Therefore, football is limited to four rounds total, one per week. Football does not have the same equity as other sports

do where they can play five and even six rounds. Therefore, we do not have the equity of playing the same number of rounds.

Football is asking for that equity by adding one week. As was alluded to earlier, it only involves two teams. This would allow all student-athletes to participate in the championship process and not force part of the athletes to become secondary citizens and play in consolation-type tournaments.

In regard to integrity, I would like to note that in the opinion of the committee, the proposed two-tiered tournament process flies in the face of the integrity of the NCAA championship process by making football the only sport where all of the student-athletes will not be involved in the postseason championship process. The two proposals that allow only 16 teams to play in the championship division also compromise the integrity of the football-enhancement program, where eight more team championship opportunities were promised. In effect, we have eight more opportunities, but they are not championship opportunities.

Ladies and gentlemen, in the interests of equity, integrity, motherhood, apple pie and the American flag—I'm trying to touch base with all the constituents in this organization—I would encourage your support for the five-week program that does not disenfranchise part of our student-athletes. Thank you. (Applause)

Porter G. Miller (Earlham College): I would like to address the issue of missed class time. It appears to me that football misses less class time for the NCAA championships. If we look to the regular season, I think that also would be true.

The proposal by the coaches at the coaches' convention said the first week there would be eight schools that would have a bye the first week. They said that they wanted to expand the tournament to five weeks, but eight schools would have a bye the first week. Those eight schools would be the top two seeds in each region. Therefore, it would be possible that when you go to the final week where you have the added week that one of those schools could be the top eighth seed. It's possible that both of those schools could be the top eighth seed. If one or both were the top eighth seed, there would absolutely be no additional class time missed because they had a bye the first week. They didn't leave campus. They didn't go away for a game. They were already home. It's a possibility that there would be no additional class time away from campus with the five-week program proposed by the football coaches.

Brandon Graham (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Hope College): Speaking as a Division III football player, I'm very excited about the 24-team expansion, but I feel that this isn't true access to a true championship. The Student-Athlete Advisory Committee has discussed it and unanimously feels that this is not a true championship that we are receiving. I'd like to read a prepared statement. "We support the idea that football goes to a 24-team playoff system. Division III's mission statement states that we value fairness and equality among all sports. Choosing football to be the only sport that doesn't allow all members who make the playoffs a chance for a national championship would definitely reduce the student-athletes' athletics experience."

We looked to men and women's soccer, which increased their national tournament from 24 to 40 teams in 1997, as a model. This expansion only marginally increased the length of time spent in the playoffs while it significantly increased the opportunity for student-athletes.

By extending the football tournament to five weeks, only the championship

game would be extended one week longer than the present 16-team tournament. A five-week tournament extends the season one week for two teams, but also increases the educational opportunities of all teams and athletes who participate in the tournament.

Student-athletes like myself who participate in football look for the same opportunity that every collegiate sport has available. Playing for a national championship allows us to reach the highest levels of achievement on the playing field as well as in the classroom. I would ask that the Presidents Council note that the student-athletes are really for this. Thank you. (Applause)

Mr. Appleton: Two comments. Thank you very much for your patience this morning when most of this was presentation. There will be good conversation continuing. This maybe is a teaser.

From time to time, I wonder what is the rationale for selecting facilitators of discussions like this?

I think in part it's to make sure that the person moderating the session doesn't have the opportunity to speak about the substance of the issue. You don't know how hard it is for me to stand here after having worked on this with some very specific opinions and be just the facilitator of this session. Curt, would you like to comment before we conclude this?

Mr. McCray: Thanks, Jim. We are going to adjourn momentarily. We're ahead of time because of your self-discipline. After lunch, we will begin the formal discussion session regarding the proposed postseason football expansion. After that, we will conduct a one-hour discussion regarding the championships automatic-qualification topic. We then will finish the afternoon with a discussion regarding gender equity and Title IX in Division III. Our afternoon is full, so I encourage you to return promptly after lunch. We will start at 1:30. Thank you.

[The delegates recessed for lunch at 11:30 a.m.]

Monday Afternoon

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. McCray: Welcome back. We'll have a discussion forum of championships, including a discussion of the football bracket expansion and of the automatic-qualification principles. There will be a break of 15 minutes this afternoon. When we reconvene, we'll discuss gender equity and issues of Title IX. There will be an open forum with additional opportunity for questions and answers. Tomorrow, we reconvene at 8 a.m. with a discussion of financial aid. We'll include the election of new Management Council representatives and again an opportunity for questions and answers.

I would like to introduce the Division III Presidents Council: David L. Beckley of Rust College; Thomas B. Courtice of Ohio Wesleyan University; Lois B. DeFleur, State University of New York at Binghamton; John DiBiaggio of Tufts University; Ann H. Die of Hendrix College; Gordon A. Haaland of Gettysburg College; Judith L. Kuipers, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse; Robert W. Neff, Juniata College; L. Jay Oliva of New York University; Gloria R. Scott of Bennett College; and Judson H. Taylor, State University of New York at Cortland. These are the current members of the Division III Presidents Council. Would you give them a round of applause, please? (Applause)

With that, I would like to get our afternoon session underway by introducing to you Dan Bridges, athletics director at the California Institute of

Technology. Dan is chair of the Championships Committee and has been cochair of the Restructuring Task Force.

CHAMPIONSHIPS FORUM

Daniel Bridges (California Institute of Technology): Thank you, President McCray.

Before we get right back into the discussion, I would like to introduce members on the dais who you have not met. Third from my left is Donna Noonan, NCAA director of championships, and I guess you've met everyone else. I will introduce all the Championship Committee members at the conclusion of today's discussion so that they can all be recognized. Most of them have either been participants on this panel or have presented something earlier today.

Before we get back into the football discussion, I'd like to review how we arrived at this point and what's going to happen after this Convention regarding these two issues. There's been some concern and discussion about that, and I just want to make a couple of points of clarification. Early this past year, the Management and Presidents Councils issued two directives to the Championships Committee. The first was to begin work on a plan that would allow automatic bids for all qualifying conferences into our team-sports championships. The second directive was to work on developing a plan for enhancing postseason opportunities in football, with the goal of bringing its participation ratio to within a 1-to-8 to 1-to-12 target ratio that we've recently achieved in the other team sports. The presidents further stipulated at the beginning of 1997 that this plan brought forward on behalf of football should not exceed four weeks.

As Walter Johnson mentioned earlier, you have before you the football options and the automatic-qualification proposals. They are works in progress. The Championships Committee intends to listen very carefully to what is being said today so we can further refine and hopefully develop a final set of recommendations that we can then pass on to the Management Council and Presidents Council for their review and possible action during this coming year.

A point of clarification in this regard is that none of this requires a vote of the membership. That was communicated to me at lunch. It's not required, but there was some question as to whether these issues would be put to a membership vote at next year's Convention. The thinking at this time is that they will not. They're administrative regulations and they will be handled by the Management Council and the Presidents Council. So it is possible that action on these items could occur prior to next year's Convention.

With that in mind, I'd like to open the floor back up for further discussion on the football issue.

Richard A. Kaiser (Olivet College): With what you've just said, it's of deep concern to me that this body—the presidents of some of our institutions, the athletics directors, the FARs and all those people—could talk to this particular body about what they feel their recommendations are and what they feel would be best for this division and we could be told, "too bad, we're going to do what we want to do." That really concerns me.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): This is interesting. This was a question that a number of the members of the Championships Committee asked. Why doesn't the membership have an opportunity to vote on these kinds of things? The explanation actually was pretty simple. The executive

regulation section of the Manual—I think it's Administrative Bylaw 31—includes all of what needs to have a vote and what doesn't. Specifically, in Article 31, postseason championship opportunities are listed. Those are specific executive regulation issues and do not require a vote. That's in the Division III Manual, so we're really handling things the way the Association is set up to handle them. It's not an arbitrary decision. I just wanted to make sure that was clear.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I'm sure that the presidents have not dug their heels in on this as yet. I would hope that they would consider that all of us on our college campuses who have football constantly treat football as the exception.

When we do scheduling, we all talk about how different it is to schedule football. When we discuss budgets with the rest of the college community or with other student-athletes and they want to know why is the football budget so huge, we talk about the exception of football because of the number of participants and the equipment and the expense of travel. When we talk about hiring athletics trainers and athletics insurance, we talk about the exception of football. If we didn't have football, we'd be reducing insurance, we'd be reducing all sorts of things.

I ask the presidents to consider the fact that we as college administrators constantly deal with football as the exception, and we consider it to be a very healthy exception in almost all instances on our campus. I would ask them to understand that football in this case is the exception. It's a very important sport to many college campuses. In particular, some of the private colleges in Division III have experienced difficulty recruiting male student-athletes. So there's lots of issues here besides just the extension of the season for one week.

Football is also the exception in a positive way in that these male student-athletes rarely miss classes, so the impact upon their academic experience is negligible. These exceptions, as they add up, I would think would cause them to conclude that here's one issue on which they could bend a bit and allow football to have a five-week championship.

Curtis W. Tong (Pomona-Pitzer Colleges): I would ditto some of the previous remarks and like to comment on football as a sport at my institution, where in recent years we've been struggling very hard to retain it as a sport and fighting the faculty influences to rid ourselves of it as a sport.

I do believe that football has a very important place on the campuses of Division III institutions in this country. It's a very important part of the learning curriculum. But I do also feel that we have forgotten that football, at a time in our history when gender equity is an issue on our campuses, is clearly taking its fair share of the pie. It happens in travel. It happens in just the costs of running the program. I don't object to that. I do object that at this time in our history that we come forward before this Convention and ask for more. I think now is not the time to ask for more.

We've been mandated by the Presidents Council—I think it's a good mandate, a healthy mandate—that we limit our postseason championships to four weeks. It makes good sense. I think that a disproportionate number of the dollars are spent by moving our football teams into a five-week championship. I think that's unfair to the whole cause of gender equity at this time. Lost in the argument are the dollars that this takes in the whole scheme of things in running our programs.

My own sense is that we would do well to have a championship with 16

teams that preferably ends in a national championship or have 32 teams and end it with four happy schools at the conclusion of a regional championship. To me, that seems to make a lot more sense.

Tony DeCarlo (John Carroll University): First of all, I'd just like to make a couple of points about the expansion of the football championship and the support of that.

Last year at the Convention, we appealed to the committee to consider football since it had been forgotten as far as championship advancement for some years. We appreciate the fact that you've come up with some options. Unfortunately, the options did not answer the question that was asked in the questionnaire in which you asked whether we wanted to advance into the championships. Then, the options proceeded in giving you everything but advancing participation for our athletes.

In last year's and at this Convention, the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee members expressed how important that experience was to those athletes. We've had it expressed on two different occasions. The athletes have spoken and indicated it's extremely important. This would give us an opportunity for approximately 400 more athletes to experience postseason competition. Last week in Dallas, our coaches voted unanimously. I think we had 70 to 80 coaches who voted and were willing to work in any way that they could to advance the opportunities in football.

Playing the fifth week could conceivably be helped if we would just stop and consider the front end of the scheduling. Many schools at this particular point, maybe one-third to one-half of our schools, open the season the week-end of September 4 or 5, have an open date and then play nine games. Many other schools play only nine games. Why can't we consider, since most schools have changed their schedules so that they're opening as far as classes are concerned earlier in August or in the early part of September, eliminating that open week and moving it all up? This has some advantages. Besides the advantage of providing an opportunity for approximately 400 student-athletes, it also provides those opportunities for people in other sports. Even though some teams would advance into the championships, many athletes would complete their seasons early in November and give them an early start to their particular winter sports, whatever they might be.

I'm a little confused as to why we even discuss all of this if it's going to be decided by the Presidents Council and if we are overwhelmingly in favor of this why it wouldn't be considered. I just don't understand why I need to be here if those decisions are going to be made without the input from our student-athletes, from our athletics directors, from our faculty reps. Thank you.

Mr. Bridges: Thank you. I might point out, Dan Dutcher reminded me that I said "possible" action this year. The current timetable as presented by the Management Council and the Championships Committee and presidents is to spend another year in review and possibly bring back more finalized proposals next year for discussion and then possibly action the following year. The football piece could be acted on this year and perhaps will be, but the current thinking on automatic qualification is that it will probably be at least one more year. We'll have one more Convention to discuss the final details of automatic qualification.

Mike Clary (Rhodes College): Before I get to some prepared remarks, I'm at a very selective institution academically. We had the good fortune in 1988 when I was the head football coach of being one of the 16 teams selected to the national playoffs.

Having been in that experience as a head coach with student-athletes who had an opportunity to compete for the national title was unforgettable. I'm now at a school that will infrequently vie for a national championship in football. We had a national champion last year in tennis, so there are opportunities. I know that our football players would want that same opportunity that our tennis player had.

While there may be some consolation for postseason play, I think even in institutions that will infrequently get into the playoffs, it would be the student-athletes' wish, the athletics director's wish, the coach's wish and I ultimately think most presidents' wish to have the opportunity to truly compete for that national title. I know there is concern; additional missed class time may result if there was a five-week playoff. As is the case in most years, the two teams who reached the finals in 1997—Mount Union and Lycoming—were No. 1 seeds in their respective regions. Due to their seed, the players at both institutions missed no class the first three weeks of the playoffs. They played at home each of those times. I think it's also important to note that one of those weekends is Thanksgiving, a time at which no classes are in session, so this also diminishes the amount of class time that a player would have to miss.

In most years, the two teams in the championship game will at most miss one Friday class during the five-week championship period. As was the case in 1997, neither Mount Union nor Lycoming had missed any class previous to the championship week. The additional week of competition will involve two of the 216 institutions that compete in Division III football.

Chuck Gordon (Emory University): I'd like to address one of the comments that Walter made. While the handbook and the rules do not require a vote, I would not be one to stand here and say that we want to deal with every issue that the Championships Committee deals with by vote. This is a major piece and a major change, and while it doesn't require it, it also doesn't prohibit it coming to the membership.

I think that should be done. I think that anything that's done based on a 1 percent return is very difficult. If we rose at a faculty meeting at our campus and extrapolated from a 1 percent return, we would have difficulty. So while it doesn't require it, I think we certainly should.

Judith L. Kuipers (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): I'm on the Presidents Council and I'm deeply disturbed by this discussion.

As the about-to-be vice-chair, I simply wouldn't have agreed to serve if I thought that what your assumptions are were true. We are experimenting with a new governance plan that I think so far is working very, very well.

The presidents have considered many variables in looking at the time factor, but have said nothing about what some kind of alternative plan might be to keep the maximum 24-team access and still have the one bowl game. I can think of at least three options myself.

The Council is committed—that's why we're all here today—to sit and to listen to what people's concerns are, see what the coaches think, see what the athletics directors think, see what the FARs think, see what the students think and genuinely listen to you and come back and deliberate among ourselves with our own particular positions about these things. That is our role. We take it very, very seriously. I want to reassure you of that.

Now I'll step back from my presidential role and just give you, for what it's worth, Judy Kuipers' role. Why couldn't you take your first- and second-ranked football champions in each of the four regional areas, give them the

byes and with some combination with what the gentleman said earlier about moving the season up one week, and stay within that four-week period? I think if people got creative, they could figure out another way and meet your criteria and stay within the four-week period. But that isn't the point. The point is that we're still in dialogue. We're still in deliberation. There has been no breakdown as far as the presidents are concerned either about your role or our role in getting the best decision for student-athletes.

Stephen R. Bamford (Plymouth State College): Judy, I respect your comments. We've been at this thing for over a year-and-a-half now. Regardless of the way you swing it or the way you look at it, there's no way of putting five weeks of competition into four weeks.

If you had some kind of a format within a four-week time frame, you would have to be playing a couple of games every six days or five days, and that certainly would impact time.

So we'd love to have somebody come up with a four-week program in which we could package five weeks of playoff action into that four-week span. It just can't be done. At least I'm not smart enough to recognize that. Thank you.

Joy L. Reighn (Rowan University): As an administrator whose team has played for the national title three out of the last five years, I've had the opportunity to observe the wonderful impact participation in this tournament has had not only on our student-athletes, but our university and student body in general.

As stated earlier by others, the sheer nature of the game only permits one contest per week. Perhaps many of the schools are only playing eight or nine games. Football participants miss far less class time than other sports, such as baseball, softball and basketball, just to name a few, so extending the season that extra week would not be a negative factor.

To not afford a small number of student-athletes the same opportunity as other student-athletes to participate in a true national championship experience just isn't consistent with our current philosophy of enhancement and equal opportunity.

Gordon A. Haaland (Gettysburg College): I'm a member of the Presidents Council. On behalf of the Council, we have been interested in increasing participation, not necessarily increasing the national championship. The focus has been on providing more opportunities for student-athletes to participate in postseason play. We are debating, in a sense, a motion that's not on the floor; something that's not really been presented to us except indirectly.

Every team and every school and every athlete has the chance to play for a national championship on September 1. They don't all get there by November 15. But we do have a national championship. We shouldn't forget that. It includes a significant number of teams that do play and enjoy it.

The issue with the Presidents Council has been one of increased opportunity within some reasonable constraint, thus the four weeks. The idea is that that seems to be a sensible amount of time beyond the normal season during which play can be completed and a champion can be crowned. A variety of proposals for additional opportunities for postseason play could be made available. Our interest has been to balance what we've been looking at for years within the NCAA—increased opportunity, but let's do it within some boundary of constraint, which is the four weeks and the postseason play that we've asked the championship group to look at.

Timothy W. Gleason (Ohio Athletic Conference): At the Division III com-

missioners' meeting yesterday, there was a strong show of hands in support of a five-week, 24-team football playoff.

Because there is no unanimous perspective on this issue, what we must essentially do is figure out the most acceptable of all of the unpreferred options. One thing needs to be made clear at this point. Football is not standing here asking for more. Now is not the time to ask for more. Football is asking to be treated the same way that everyone else already is. There's a difference in asking for more and asking for the same.

A five-week, 24-field playoff seems to be the fairest. It is the only option that is genuinely in line with the NCAA's acceptable ratio of participation. True, there is a small price to pay. Twenty-two of the 24 teams will end their seasons within the current four-week playoff format. Two teams will have to play on a fifth week. We must ask ourselves, is that small price for those two teams more acceptable than what we currently have or what we have seen?

Glenn Hedden (Kean University): I speak as a member of the Montclair State football team, winner of the 1970 Division III Knute Rockne Bowl, a coaching staff member of two Division III institutions involved in postseason championships, and presently as a member of the Division III Football Committee.

I would like you to consider the following facts: Football is the only sport played by NCAA Division III members that does not enjoy the opportunity to practice and play the maximum number of weeks allowed—the 21-week rule—or span two academic semesters. Unlike other sports, there is very little class time missed for midweek games because there's only one game a week, usually Friday or Saturday. The football preseason mostly is conducted before classes start and there is little missed class time. The regular season of 10 to 11 weeks is played on weekends. The playoffs currently span four weeks with 16 teams participating. If we went to the five-week situation, the total number of weeks, including the championship, would be a maximum of 17½ weeks, which is far less than the 21-week rule.

Just because football is unique, please do not shortchange our student-athletes. When we speak of equity, it should be equity for all. In conclusion, yes, football is the "F" word, fairness.

John M. Schael (Washington University, Missouri): Washington University's campus has had football since 1890, so I speak to you as an athletics director who's never qualified for a national championship in football.

That's a long history, and we're not disappointed, either. We strive, just as you starting out on the first day of September, to be the best we can be when we get to the football field. It just hasn't worked out for us.

When I came to the Convention this year, I was really considering two options that I've discussed thoroughly with our football coaches. One had to do with the 16-team format with the national invitational tournament concept—the NIT invitational concept—the other option was the 16-team format with the four regional bowl games. That was pretty exciting. But then I come to find out that we're discussing thoroughly a 24-team format. Now I'm a convert. It seems to make an awful lot of sense after having an opportunity to discuss with our colleagues in Division III some of the advantages. It would put football into the same alignment as all other team sports in terms of having a true national championship. That's all they're asking for. Just provide the football players and football-supporting institutions with the opportunity for a national championship, as we provide for all of our oth-

er sports for our young men and women who participate. I don't think we're taking away any time from their educational studies. They select our institutions to have opportunities, not only in the classroom, but certainly on the fields of play, regardless of what sport it is.

The last thing that we'd want to do is jeopardize their growth as a student. The 24-team championship enhances the experience that they're going to have on our college campuses. I urge your support for a 24-team championship.

Mr. Bridges: Thank you. I'd like to make one point. I don't want to necessarily steer the discussion because we're really here to listen, but it might be informative if some of you speak in terms of if we can't go to five weeks. What would we prefer? You may at the same time voice your preference for five weeks.

If the mandate stays the same, the Championships Committee is going to walk away from this Convention with no more information than it came into it with. If the mandate stays at four weeks, we're still left with two options. We really don't know if you have a strong preference for one of those two options or not. I'm just throwing that out there. I'm not trying to influence you in any way, but we would like to hear if any of you do have strong opinions regarding the two options that are on the table. As I said, please feel free to voice your opinion in favor of the five-week option, but if that doesn't happen, perhaps you do have a strong opinion about the other two options.

Steve Miller (Cornell College): I am a member of the Division III football coaches council. We discussed this question quite thoroughly last week in Dallas. I think it really hinges on a couple of very simple questions.

We're hearing a lot of discussion about access. That clearly is a part of this question. We're hearing a lot about equity. In fact, those two principles, which I think really guide this decision, are NCAA principles that are to be established across all of our sports programs. It seems to be a relatively easy decision. A 16-team bracket does not meet either one of those criteria of equity or access to championships.

A number of options have been raised about the five-week schedule. With byes for eight teams in the first round, you would in effect have one more contest than you'd have if you played a 16-team championship than an eight-team championship to the end. I think many of the implementation questions can be resolved. I was very happy to hear that the Presidents Council does not have a closed mind on this issue because I've heard a lot of discussion this morning about what a wonderful governance structure we have and how effectively it is working. If it truly is working, it would seem to me that the opinion of our Student-Athlete Advisory Committee, the opinion of the membership at the football coaches meeting in Dallas, which had a unanimous vote, the opinion of the football committee and our Championships Committee should carry some weight with the Management Council and the Presidents Council in regard to what I think are the two guiding principles—access and equity. I believe we have creative minds and that we can create a system in which all 24 teams truly would have access to championships and not access to a satellite tournament.

For all of the institutions that do not sponsor football, could you imagine taking a women's soccer tournament and having 33 percent of those participants go somewhere else and play for a championship that is not part of the national title or taking a third of our wrestlers at the national wrestling meet and putting them in another championship gym and say you people wres-

tle for something over here while everybody else is wrestling for the national title over here? I do believe the options including all 24 teams can be worked out. I would ask for an opportunity to do that from the Presidents Council. This is my first year in the position of director of athletics, and I'm almost tired of providing 26 weeks of practice for seven or eight weeks when I see football being restricted to 15 or 16. Now, one-third of the participants would be deprived of competing for the national championship.

Terry McMillan (Mississippi College): Can we take a straw vote to see how the membership feels about all of this? I'd like to know how the membership feels.

Mr. Bridges: We will be able to conduct a straw vote, but we would like to wait until we've discussed this issue completely. When we near our time limit, then we'll probably conduct a straw vote.

John L. Van Iwaarden (Hope College): At Hope College, I'm a member of the athletics committee as a part of our campus governance structure and the faculty athletics rep. Oftentimes, many faculty members approach me with concern about students missing classes. As an educator, I am very concerned about this. However, there are a couple of sports that are particularly vulnerable to this in our northern climate, in particular baseball and softball, but the sport of football is not one of those. In fact, I think faculty is particularly pleased with the minimal number of classes that are missed by football players. In fact, a five-week championship tournament for 24 teams, as reasoned earlier, would not have an adverse effect on the educational experience. I believe it would enhance both the cultural and educational experiences for the players.

As a full-time educator and a sports devotee, I would encourage the Presidents Council to reconsider its decision to limit the football championship to four weeks and allow football to be in the 1-to-8, 1-to-12 format to give the maximum experience to our student-athletes with a true championship.

William T. Klika Jr. (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): From what I've heard and what I've experienced, the football coaches are unanimous in their decision. The student-athletes are unanimous in their decision. Football deserves the same fairness. I point out one other problem. If you go to automatic qualifiers, you may qualify a team into a satellite tournament. Think about that.

David A. Jacobs (Whittier College): I like to look at this as an example of the wisdom of the Presidents Council in giving us one of those Christmas puzzle boxes that you play with for 10 minutes and it doesn't work. You can't open it. You get instructions.

I think they've created a lot of dialogue, a lot of it seemingly negative, about the idea by putting the wall up there for the four-week playoff. I'd like to look at it a little differently and say that it is a four-week playoff with 24 teams in all reality. When you have a 24-team bracket and the top two teams in each division have byes already—in the sport of football, where there's tremendous home-field advantage, weather factors and so forth—the chances of the first 16 teams playing those five weeks are minimal. It's a chance.

In all practicality, we have an eight-team tournament, so what's wrong with the 16-team tournament we have now? I would like to look at it as a former chair of the basketball committee as one of the reasons that some sports have expanded tournaments with play-ins. I think this is a play-in tournament with the first round and the next four rounds as the true championship. You play in that first bracket of 16. The top two in each region,

which is a total of eight, get that bye and in reality you really have a four-team playoff.

I think there's a lot of solutions in having this four-week playoff in five weeks with a play-in format if we're willing to concede some other things, and I haven't heard that yet. I come from a conference that plays nine games. We're happy with nine games. That's enough for football. Some play eight in our conference. Some of you can play 10 games and you play on. We play nine in 11 weeks. Some of you play 10 in 11 weeks. Eliminate that bye. Move the schedule up a little bit. There's cost except for the final two teams. As for the bowl concept, to spend all this money for games that don't count, I don't think is acceptable to the NCAA membership. What about moving up the front end? To us, that's unacceptable because it's another week of preschool expenses. That doesn't work. I would like to see nine-games in a 10-week schedule being played in the regular season, then play the play-in tournament and then our four-week championship.

I think it will work out nicely. It will give everybody some opportunities to compete. The games will count. Nobody wants to play games or coach games that don't count. Thank you.

Mr. Appleton: I do think it is useful to have a straw vote. I think it would be very helpful to all the Councils that would end up needing to confront this issue further.

I think it is important also to note, however, the presidents of the Association are going to have to act on this. I think it's just fair play to note both of those things. It's very important to listen to the body that's here, but the presidents are not here for the most part. I want to point out both of those things.

I want to comment also on basically five very quick points. I want to note that we, as presidents, cannot treat football like all other sports. Much of the dialogue here has been pointed in that direction—football should be treated like all other sports. In almost all other environments, we are asked to treat football differently, not like all other sports, in terms of the costs to our athletics program, about how we must struggle with that in terms of dealing with gender equity, in terms of the cost and the impact on the rest of our programs in terms of the resources that go to the football program. Likewise, we cannot treat postseason play in football just like all other sports. It is not an argument of equity in this regard. I think there's been some pretty false arguments listed. The main reason that it can't be treated the same is because it is a sport that can only be played one game per week. The argument that it must be treated exactly the same is an interesting one that is posited in this discussion. The exact opposite is posited in almost every other discussion about football.

I want to comment about the student-athlete. I don't mean to speak on their behalf. I'm going to speak on my behalf relative to them, because they will speak on their own. But most of us have many, if not by far the majority, of our students working as well as going to school and participating in athletics. So when we talk about the argument that there is less missed class time, it's also a shortsighted argument. We've got to pay attention to the amount of time they're spending in work as well as class and their preparation for their academic work. It's a three-part concern that I have about extending the season all the way into and in many cases through exams. I think we've got to take into account work, missed class time as compared to the preparation and the attention on the academic program.

The argument of coming in early is very difficult for some presidents

to accept. When you look at not just the athletics cost, but the orientation and the food cost, this is an expense that many of us are not in a position to bear. Many presidents want to argue for increased access to postseason play, not necessarily national championships. I want to again point out the difference there.

In fact, I think the argument in favor of this championship play would be an unbelievable surprise to many of our Division I colleagues. I see in this argument a lot of Division I "wannabes." Forgive me for being sharp, but I think it doesn't fit our Division III philosophy. I think there are more options. I think we ought to stay with the four-week limitation unless some other changes are made. For example, David mentioned going to a nine-game season and then allotting time to postseason play. On the other hand, that limits more opportunity for the bulk of our students. But if the two options are not good, that's another thing. From my point of view, it's not a very popular position. I would strongly favor 32 teams having access to postseason play with four tournaments of eight teams. It would conclude in three weeks, not four, and would provide a wonderful opportunity. The athletes who would come after the present format and who are not used to a national championship in football I believe would have the same kind of postseason experience moving to that four-level, four-tiered program that the students are experiencing in today's national championship.

James Lackenmier (King's College, Pennsylvania): I'm the president of King's College in Pennsylvania and a member of the Mid-Atlantic Conference.

My colleague, the AD from Susquehanna, earlier said he thinks that the presidents are probably not "dug in." I came here, and I'm not "dug-in" on this question. I'm finding the discussion interesting. I'm learning a lot about it. I think the discussion needs to go on.

I do have a governance position, however. The reform that took place a couple of years ago put the ultimate responsibility in the hands of the presidents working through the Commissions. But, as you very well know, there are not a lot of presidents here now to speak for their institutions. I would go back and confer with the people on my campus, with my colleagues, the presidents of the conference and with the commissioner of our conference. I would ask the Presidents Commission to—I think this would be more effective than a straw vote later on—return the question. Do the question one more time with the presidents who have had a chance to have the benefit of the feedback that comes back to their campuses from the representatives.

During the course of the next couple of months, that could be done. I think there are issues that have been raised here that people did not come expecting to talk about. We had the options and now the possibility of a five-week playoff comes up again. I think that it should be talked about on the campuses and in the conferences and that the Presidents Commission should poll us or discuss that matter with us again.

Mr. Bridges: Thank you. There are two more people at the microphones. Those will be the last comments from the floor. I'll then ask anybody on the panel if they have comments. Bridget then will conduct a straw vote. As chair of the Management Council, she will come forward and present a few options just to give us some idea of where you all really stand on this issue, if there's any doubt.

Jill Gremmels (Wartburg College): I'm a faculty rep and I have not yet heard a persuasive argument why four weeks is the magic number. The pres-

idents have said three things that I've heard. One is that it seems sensible. Two is that we've thought it all through. Third is we're the presidents and we say so. At the same time, I've heard a lot of refutations that to me are stronger arguments.

The class-time issue it seems has been dealt with. The five-week playoff would fall within the regulation of 21 weeks. It would affect only two teams, both of which would probably have had a bye in the first week. I'm a reasonable person. I'm willing to be convinced that four weeks is the right number, but I need to hear some stronger arguments for four weeks than I've heard so far.

We were also asked to discuss the two options. If we are only presented with those two options in the straw vote, then those of us who support the five-week playoff should abstain to prevent any interpretation of the vote as an endorsement of one or the other of these seemingly unacceptable alternatives.

Julie Fernandez (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Maryville University of St. Louis): I want to respond to President Appleton's comments. I appreciate your concerns. As student-athletes, we all appreciate the concerns of the presidents regarding the time demands that are placed on us when we're in season.

However, I would like to respond by saying that in Division III, we want the opportunity. We want the opportunity to learn how to balance our time, to have the discipline to know when we need to spend time on our studies versus time on our sports. As a two-sport athlete for two years at my university, my grades were always better when I was in season. I was disciplined. I knew when I had to study, I did what I had to do to earn my degree. The Division III Student-Athlete Advisory Committee is all about creating opportunity. Thank you. (Applause)

Annette Shapiro (Nazareth College): How much is it going to cost and where is the money coming from? Will it come out of other programs?

Mr. Bridges: Those are good questions. The Budget Committee has identified a surplus of unallocated funds above the 10-percent savings that we recommended. I believe those unallocated funds at this time are sufficient to cover any of the options that are being discussed here. I heard the number this morning, but I don't know it off the top of my head. Somewhere in the vicinity of \$600,000.

Just to give you an idea, Dan is clarifying that Option No. 1 would be about \$130,000. Option No. 2 has been estimated to cost about \$70,000. The five-week option has been estimated roughly to cost about \$120,000 to \$130,000. Any of those options would fit well within the amount of money that's currently unallocated for championships or unallocated in Division III. So money is not a serious concern in this regard. We knew that we were going to have to enhance football, and we have set aside money and made plans in that regard.

I'd like to ask if any of our panelists would like to make a statement before Bridget conducts a straw vote. Steve.

Stephen R. Bamford (Plymouth State College): Thank you, Dan. I just want to make a point of clarification to clear up some confusion that people expressed to me at lunch time today.

I want to make it abundantly clear that while Ray and I earlier today were charged with the responsibility of describing or giving a brief synopsis of the two models coming out of the football survey sent out last summer, we as an eight-person football committee stand unified in unanimous support of the

five-week, 24-team postseason opportunity for all teams to play for a national championship.

At the outset of our deliberations as a committee about a year-and-a-half ago, we were instructed not to give any thought or consideration to the five-week concept and say that it was dead in the water. The sole responsibility of our committee was to develop other options that could be presented to the membership at this Convention. I wanted to clarify that. We stand unified in full support of the 24-team, five-week concept.

Bridget Belgiovine (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): At this time, I would ask that you take out your voting units. Please note that the purpose for the voting units is simply to get an accurate count. It will be anonymous. Institutional identification will not be on the voting lines other than the unit allows us to get an accurate number count. Any voting delegate in the room is to vote if they so choose. This is a membership budget issue, so all delegates can cast their votes.

We will do two votes. Vote No. 1 will be for Option No. 1, which is the 16-team national championship and the eight-team, three-week national invitational. Option No. 2 would be the 16-team national championship with the eight-team, one-week regional concept. Option No. 3 is for the five-week, 24-team national championship. No. 4 on the voting units would be for abstentions. Are there any questions? Hearing no major grumblings, let's take the vote. You are voting for either one of the three options or abstaining. Cast your vote, please. The polls are now closed.

Let me explain the second vote while we're waiting for results. The second vote would be to receive information from you for the Championships Committee, Management Council and Presidents Council. If the five weeks does not get approved, we need to know your response on Option No. 1 and Option No. 2 or your preference. So the second vote will be Option No. 1, touch Pad "1 or yes." Option No. 2, "no or touch No. 2," and then abstention is No. 3. That will be the second vote. Questions?

Bill Zwaan (Widener University): I'm Widener's athletics director and the head football coach. I honestly don't feel as though we've discussed the two options. We've basically only discussed the five-week format up until this time. I know as a football coach, the bowl-game format is a better format because I can't possibly imagine getting kids ready to play for three weeks for no reason at all. There ought to be more discussion of those two options before we vote and give the committee the thought the five-week plan is not acceptable, which it may very well be. I know that people want to move on with this, but I don't think those options have been discussed very clearly.

Ms. Belgiovine: We did provide that opportunity in this past hour. Dan did make it a point to say that those two options were available and we did need to hear your input.

Unidentified Delegate: Can we get the results of the first one?

Ms. Belgiovine: We are ready for results of the first vote.

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): Is there any opportunity to consider the suggestion from President Appleton about a 32-team regional or bowl concept or is that something that will be considered in the discussion after the Convention? Are we really limited to these three potential options?

Ms. Belgiovine: Linda, that option was on the table earlier in the past year and has not been fully discussed. However, we can certainly as a

Management Council discuss that at the post-Convention meeting. But to have the membership vote on that today does not seem appropriate given the fact that option wasn't mailed. The membership received full detail of Option Nos. 1 and No. 2. Given the fact that it's been raised, it can be discussed at the post-Convention meeting if the membership would agree to that.

Richard A. Kaiser (Olivet College): I think the unwillingness of this body to discuss Option 1 and Option 2 really is your answer. Neither one of those options is really anything that any of us want anything to do with. The problem is in what the charge was to the Management Council—enhanced championship opportunities. Enhanced means increased. Championship means the best of everyone. Neither one of those options gives that opportunity.

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you. Based on Dick's comment, you have an abstention option on the key pad. The results of the first vote, Option No. 1, which was the 16-team national championship, eight-team, three-week national invitational—eight votes. Option No. 2, the 16-team national championship, eight-team, one-week game—19. Option No. 3, the five-week, 24-team national championship—167 votes; abstentions, 41.

We are now ready for the second vote. Again, you are voting for Option No. 1, key pad yes or 1. Option No. 2, key pad no or 1, and abstentions would be No. 3.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): This is possibly a stretch for a point of clarification, but if you're looking for feedback, if the membership abstains, I think you're going to get a vote similar to what you just got. I would like to encourage the membership to give them some feedback on Option 1 and Option No. 2. If, in fact, a decision has to be made that's different than what the first vote suggested, by default, you might wind up with something that you don't really want.

Ms. Belgiovine: That would be an appreciated point of clarification, Judy. If the chair could, I'd like to make one comment. I certainly hope that in this new structure, and as we've progressed the last two years before coming out of last year's Convention, that the membership would recognize that the bodies that are working on your behalf are doing it on your behalf. There really are no personal, vested interests in many cases about the discussions. We are working and listening to what the membership is telling us and trying to comply and work within the mission and the philosophy of this division. Judy's point of clarification is a serious one. Never do we think we are showing something at you. We would hope that you don't feel that from your representatives within the division. Let us now proceed with the vote.

Kenneth Kutler (Hartwick College): Without discussion, could we get a two-minute synopsis of 1 versus 2? Could someone on the panel give a quick synopsis? I hear rumblings around the room that people don't really know exactly what we're voting for. Without any debate on it, we'd just like to hear a little bit more about it. Thank you.

Mr. Bamford: It's very simple. The national invitational option provides for 24 teams, 16 in one separate bracket for a national championship, and an eight-team bracket playing over three weeks at the end of the regular season for a national invitational championship. The national invitational championship would be played in all rounds on campus sites. The national championship bracket would be played on campus sites for the first three rounds. The fourth round, the national championship game, would be played at the Stagg Bowl. Currently, it's being played at Salem, Virginia.

For the national championship and invitational bowl concept, we're talking 24 teams again. The top four teams from each of the four regions in the country are selected to participate in that national championship bracket. The next two teams—the fifth- and sixth-ranked teams from each of the regions—would play in a one-weekend bowl game. The sixth-ranked team in each region would be playing at the campus site of the fifth-ranked team. One-week tournament, one-week bowl. That ends their season. Four teams go home as winners. Four teams go home as losers in the bowl. The four-week concept in the national championship and the other bracket continues on to crown a national champion.

Ms. Belgiovine: Thank you, Steve. In the spirit of trying to receive feedback, would you like 10 minutes for comments from the membership?

Unidentified Delegates: No.

Ms. Belgiovine: Got that one. I didn't need the voting units to get that one. We are then ready for a vote.

Option No. 1, 16-team national championship, eight-team national invitational, with three weeks. Option No. 2, 16-team national, eight teams, one week, and 3 is abstention. Please cast your votes. The polls are now closed.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): Would there be any opportunity to have a straw vote on a five-week, 24-team schedule with reducing the season to nine games within a 10-week session? I know we could go on forever, but I think that has merit.

Ms. Belgiovine: We will come back to the question that was just raised. Here are the results of the second vote. Option No. 1—26 votes. Option No. 2—114 votes. Abstentions, 105.

Unidentified Delegate: Repeat those once more.

Ms. Belgiovine: Option No. 1, 26. Option No. 2, 114. Abstentions, 105. If you have your paddles handy, we can move this next one very quickly and accommodate the request of the previous speaker.

If we were to go to a five-week schedule, all those in favor of eliminating one game from the football schedule, please raise your paddle. Who might be willing to consider eliminating one game from your season so it would, in essence, be a nine-game schedule? Please raise your paddles. Thank you. All opposed. Thank you. Abstentions. Thank you. The sense was that the majority of the membership was opposed to decreasing to nine games. At this time, I'll turn the microphone back to Dan Bridges.

AUTOMATIC QUALIFICATION FORUM

Mr. Bridges: Thank you very much for that discussion and those votes. That does give us some direction. Clearly, we have our work cut out for us on this issue. We will get to work on it immediately following the Convention.

If we could now shift gears, we do want to press on to the automatic qualification.

My colleagues this morning did an excellent job of explaining and outlining the issues and giving you a good deal of information to think about. We'd like to hear what you have to say about that or if you have any questions regarding the whole concept of automatic qualification.

Connie Zotos (Drew University): This is more of a point of clarification. I see that there are two bullets here that say that the conference has to have been a member of the Association for two years and that they must have been competing in that sport for two years. But there's nothing here—there may be in NCAA legislation—that says all of the institutions within your

conference that you're using to count the seven had to have been playing that sport for two years. Is that intended here or is it not? In other words, if we played lacrosse with eight in the conference and then add two, in that year when those two add, do we automatically get a qualifier or do they have to play for two years before you have a qualification?

Mr. Bridges: They're eligible right away the way it's structured right now.

Ms. Zotos: Then I would suggest that that be added.

Mr. Bridges: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Kaiser: In looking at the various information that we received, you'll notice that basketball is represented by more institutions in both men and women than in any other sport. As we look at the current proposal under the automatic qualifiers, I think there needs to be some questions raised as to exactly how are they going to handle opportunities for nonchampionship teams?

Within the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association, I have a serious concern as to what's going to happen to our league-ending tournament, which happens to be the largest fund-raiser for our entire conference. If you played a conference league schedule of 14 games, and then go to the championship tournament for the league-ending season and your automatic qualifier comes out of that, why would you want to play 14 games and then want to even have a league tournament with the possibility you may not get an opportunity if you don't win that tournament?

Within our region, we have six leagues within our region. We will only be allotted six opportunities. Therefore, a team that does not win our conference championship will not have an opportunity, unless they go as an independent. There are only five opportunities and 12 potential at-large berths. There are parts of the country that have outstanding basketball programs. I'm not against the automatic qualifiers, but I'm definitely against the opportunities that second-place teams that may lose on a last-second shot might have on this particular situation.

This particular proposal puts into serious jeopardy some of the season-ending tournaments with the automatic qualifier going to the season-ending tournament winner.

Ms. Belgiovine: Dick, the conferences have the opportunity to make that decision. That's why we left that in there. Conferences can determine which way they want to dictate the automatic qualifier. You may choose not to use the conference tournament champion. That would be an issue the conference can determine.

Ted Hurwitz (City University of New York Athletic Conference): I'd like to speak strongly for the automatic qualification. I'm not going to speak as to whether it should be seven or six or what the criteria should be, just the idea.

At the CUNYAC conference, three years ago our women received automatic qualification. Since that time, our conference has added two women's basketball teams that were dormant and one that didn't have any athletics teams at all but made sure that women's basketball was included. This past year, we were notified that we did not meet the qualifications. We would at this time never be chosen as an at-large team because we just can't compete at that level. We do want the opportunity. It has helped us with gender equity. It has helped us with Title IX. We got everybody involved, including the presidents, at all of our schools. We've made it a very big thing.

When we lost the bid, we appealed. We were told at the committee level that our teams the previous two years were seeded No. 8. We played a No. 1

seed, a Final Four and final-eight participant. We lost by quite a number of points. Therefore, our conference was not going to be given the automatic qualification for this particular year. It has hurt us tremendously. We keep our head up. Simultaneously with receiving that notice, we did get the news from the Management Council and Presidents Council that they were going forward to try to give all qualified teams inclusion, not exclusion.

There have been times that all of us have felt that committees have not chosen a team for one reason or another. I feel that the automatic qualification is a great, great equalizer. It is much more objective. It helps because many teams will not play you if you are, quote, in a "weaker division."

The experience that I repeated at my Division III commissioners' meeting the other day I think was very pointed. A team from my conference was not chosen although they had a better record and had beaten one of the teams that was chosen. We were told that the reason was that our strength of schedule was not strong enough and that the team that we beat had played two nationally ranked teams and lost. They received greater merit for that. I think that if we have the automatic qualification, this will give us an opportunity—our women and our men—to compete and to have the experience and enhanced things that Division III has put forward. Thank you.

James E. Nelson (Suffolk University): My name is Don Quixote from Windmill University, and I have a possible dream. That's just my pseudonym.

I have been privileged to have witnessed first-hand in a coaching capacity the first four Division III basketball championships nearly a quarter century past. I and our membership have welcomed the inclusion of a national championship in women's basketball since and, over the past three years, the sponsorship of a 64-team national tournament for both our men's and our women's teams. Restructuring in Division III brings forward opportunity and challenge for our membership. The enhancement package will provide increased opportunities of postseason play for certain team sports save one—men's and women's basketball.

Yes, you all are aware that the men's and women's national championship for all rounds will be fully funded. However, as opposed to other team sports, the number of basketball-participating institutions will decrease from 64 to 48 teams. Regardless of the debate concerning automatic qualification, the diminution of championship opportunities for student-athletes is not viewed as enhancement. As the national chair for men's basketball, I have been privileged to have been involved in debate on this issue and have witnessed the dismay of administrators, coaches and student-athletes in the loss of that championship opportunity. Automatic qualification and championship play presents challenges to all of our NCAA sport committees and the perceived quality of a championship field, as was discussed this morning.

Although there is not unanimity on the men's basketball committee as to the automatic-qualification principles, I and the majority of committee members view "AQs" for all qualified conferences as consistent with the Division III philosophy. However, our Division III philosophy statement states that it encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for our students. With that in mind, I would request that this body have consideration in returning to the highly successful and popular 64-team concept for men's and women's basketball. I certainly fully understand that such a return deviates from the 1-to-8 ratio. However, there are certain unique aspects for each of our sport offerings.

Why do I think there is a uniqueness for men's and women's basketball?

Basketball is played over two academic seasons. Granted, so is ice hockey, a sport that I love dearly. However, hockey is still a regional sport as opposed to the national scope of basketball. Basketball for men and women represents two of the three most popular offerings, as is indicated on the green sheet that you received. The positive publicity engendered in the media for the sport reaches a crescendo at tournament time. Although for some of us it might be anathema to provide credit to Division I, there is no doubt that "March Madness" and the Final Four provide the necessary funding for all of our Division III championships.

Basketball has recently been chronicled as the most popular sport activity in America, with 45,600,000 participating nationwide in organized activity. I would request review of the 64-team concept and its implementation and providing a national championship encompassing all automatic-qualifying conferences, of which we can all well be proud.

I certainly hope that there are other "Sancho Panzas" who will wave their swords with this Don Quixote at the windmill before us. I have also taken the liberty to have marketed this hat that I hold up to you that has a basketball and a "64" on it, with NCAA Division III on the back. I do report that this is not an officially licensed NCAA product. However, if you do wish to order it, please see me off site. Thank you very much.

William A. Marshall (Franklin and Marshall College): Jim's a tough man to follow. A couple of observations or questions to bring to the committee.

For those institutions that hold membership in two playing conferences, I have some concerns about whether the committee has really thought through that process. What happens when somebody wins both conferences or somebody wins one conference, but they're using the other conference as their automatic qualifier? Do you then get a second-place team automatically qualifying? There's some uncertainty in my mind about what happens to those. Could somebody respond to that when I'm done?

The second question I have concerns the spring sport automatic qualifiers. I know there are substantial numbers of Division III institutions that by the first week in May are into exams and pretty well out of business. If championships like baseball and softball don't get contested until the third or fourth week in May, we're looking at some substantial expenses to keep people on campus to prepare for championships unless there is reimbursement coming back from the NCAA to help with that process.

If that does indeed happen and you have a conference with differing academic calendars, it puts an institution in a real bind to say to their colleagues, who may be graduating later, that we don't really want to keep our people around waiting for that automatic qualifier to be decided so we're not going to agree to be in an automatic-qualifying conference. Your conference championship wouldn't be considered as an automatic qualifier. I have some real concerns about what is going to happen in the spring.

Let me make one other observation. I had lunch this noon with a number of Division I colleagues. There are some Division I folks who are feeling very disenfranchised during this Convention. Although our debate has been spirited at times, I find that to be very refreshing. I hope that the committees and the membership can get together and have a good wedding and listen to each other. Maybe there are some ways to have both automatic qualification and also have the best teams in the field. If that means that we go to the expanded basketball bracket and pay as you go or play-in into the first

round, I'd rather have something like that happen than just to pick one or the other.

Walter J. Johnson (North Central College): Those were excellent comments. The main reason for this forum is to get feedback just like that, because there is the possibility that we have not taken the final point far enough. We do address the issue of institutes holding membership in two conferences, but we didn't go far enough to determine whether or not they needed to declare in which conference they might want that automatic qualification to take place. So that's a very good point.

The second issue is that I also want to remind you that this is again the first step. There are things along the way that we can take a look at and adjust. Even though we're looking at a 48-team bracket in basketball now, that is an issue that we need to look at for the future. I'm sure that we will take some additional time to do that. The issue of having the best teams in the tournament has not been completely defined. I know that we have to do it within the context of additional access for conference champions. The more input you give us, the better off we're going to be in trying to find the best possible solution.

Lyn Maurer (Kalamazoo College): In speaking about this issue with others, it seems to me that most of us are not opposed to the concept of automatic qualification. The problem comes with the practical format that has been presented. I know the committee has spent many hours debating this. But there are some points that I would like to see the committee consider.

First, the independent ratio of 1-to-8 is the same as the smallest ratio for conferences. I would like to see the committee take the average size of conferences receiving automatic qualification and have the independents adhere to that number for qualification. I also would like to see the committee consider lumping the independents and the at-large berths together. A third consideration I would like to see is a bottom-line winning record for automatic qualifications from conferences.

Mr. Bridges: Thank you. Those are good points. We will take those into consideration.

Lisa Melendy (Williams College): I question whether automatic qualification reaches the goal of putting the emphasis on regular-season play or does it actually put more emphasis on the tournament championships and postseason play?

Generally, I'm not in favor of automatic qualification for a number of reasons, especially in Division III. The regionalization we've done the past few years already increased access in some ways, but I'd particularly like to focus on one area—the student-athlete. This morning, the mission statement that we all read said, in part, "special importance would be given to the impact of athletics on the participants." Again, I want to focus on that for a minute.

First of all, ask people to think about what is the educational purpose of the national championships? To me, it seems to be rewarding a team for a job well done and to allow a team to test itself against the next level of competition. For a team to go into the national tournament when it did not put its best season together seems inappropriate to me, as does leaving students out who reached their goals and playing potential. I'm wondering what these two different groups of students are learning through this process.

Automatic qualification also seems to run counter to the educational value of the tournament itself. To potentially have teams in the championship

that will not truly challenge the competition to perform at their highest level also seems wrong.

Finally, I believe playing in the championship tournament is a privilege that is earned through dedication and hard work and is not a right. I wonder what the student-athletes feel about automatic qualification? I'm sure they'll tell us about it in a minute.

It seems to me that student-athletes who meet their goals through a season's competition and are shut out of the tournament will not care which conferences are represented in their place. They'll simply be denied the opportunity to test themselves at the next level. I'd ask you all to focus on the student-athletes in this discussion and the educational purpose of holding these championships.

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Before we get too far along with other comments, I wanted to back up and address something a previous speaker mentioned about setting a minimum won-loss standard as a possible criterion for automatic qualifiers.

The Championships Committee actively debated this concept and finally came up with not including a minimum standard. We all know that in a conference championship tournament an underdog can come through and maybe not have a .500 record and yet win the conference championship. If there is anybody who feels strongly about this one way or another, we'd love to hear those comments because I think this would provide us with valuable input. Thank you.

John D. Galaris (Salem State College): Two points, Dan. The first being that I'd like to speak in favor of automatic qualification for our conference champions. Without getting too far down the road on that, those people have earned the right, at least in my opinion, through their regular-season play amongst their respective institutions to represent that conference in a championship where they meet the criteria and all the other things that we require.

As a point of clarification—maybe Dan Dutcher has the answer to this—it seems to me two, three or four years ago, we dealt with the issue of an institution being in more than one conference that earned an automatic and that issue was dealt with at the national level. I believe there was an answer to that.

Daniel T. Dutcher (NCAA Staff): Donna Noonan knows much more about these championship issues than I do. She said the interpretation is they would have to declare which conference they would want before the season started.

Mr. Schael: Under the requirements, the first bullet says conferences must have at least seven NCAA members that sponsor the sport if they're looking for automatic qualification. What constitutes a legitimate conference member?

For example, you have five teams within a seven-team conference that sponsor a particular sport. You pull in two additional teams from outside your conference in let's say field hockey or football. It doesn't make any difference. Now you have seven in your conference. Do you get automatic qualification? Is that legitimate? Is that the intended purpose of going to this type of a structure? Or should there be a greater commitment on the part of a conference if they're going to receive automatic qualification?

The second question I have regards conferences with 14 or more members receiving an additional automatic berth. Does that seem to be fair? What's the rationale for that?

Mr. Bridges: Thank you, John. On your first question, the answer is "yes." Currently, as the rules are written in draft form, a conference with five members could pull in two. It would be eligible for an automatic. And "no," that was not our intention. So at least that may be of some comfort. That was not our intention. We're not trying to encourage that. This is just another example of something that needs to be worked through. I'm glad you made that point. What was your second point, John?

Mr. Schael: If your conference has 14 members...

Mr. Bridges: That's another issue that we debated at some length. At this time, we felt we'd throw it out there for discussion to allow two spots for any conference that has more than 14 members. As I said, it certainly wasn't unanimous among the members of the Championships Committee, but we thought we'd throw that out there and see what the membership felt about that, whether or not that was fair. There are two legitimate arguments to that point. Frankly, we wanted to see what you felt about it.

Robert Morrissey (Student-Athlete Advisory Committee/Vassar College): Our committee supports all efforts to increase access to championship opportunities for conference champions in all team sports while assuring equitable access for independent institutions.

As student-athletes, we feel that the championship experience is a valuable one and it is an opportunity to experience competition on the highest of levels. Our committee feels that making the selection process more objective, as the automatic qualification principle suggests, is to the student-athletes' benefit. At the same time, it affords access to championships to the most qualified teams. In the present model, the stronger conferences get stronger while the weaker remain weak.

Jeffrey W. Cohen (Brandeis University): If the dichotomy of what we're talking about is between keeping the 1-to-8 concept, keeping the automatic qualifier and trying to get the strongest teams in, perhaps we could change the rules slightly and say the 1-to-8 governs the point at which the NCAA money stops. So if we have stronger teams ready to play in a particular sport—basketball being the obvious example—that the play-in round is not covered by NCAA funds. Since these are generally regional competitions expense is relatively low. This might be a way to try to catch both ends of the tiger.

Mr. Bridges: Thank you. If you remember, one of our principles is that we would like all competition in championships play to be fully funded.

We feel that that is the only fair way to do it when you have some sports out there having play-ins and other sports not having play-ins for various reasons. That is something that thus far the Management Council, Presidents Council and the Championships Committee do not favor. They want to fully fund all of the championships. It may be that the principle of automatic qualification may give us reason to rethink our 1-to-8 ratio in certain situations. That, frankly, hasn't developed yet.

If we're really committed to the principle of automatic qualification and we're also committed to making sure that all of our independent institutions are proportionally represented and we also have enough at-large berths to reward quality at-large independent and conference members, we may at some point have to look at in certain sports further bracket enhancement. That may come around or may surface as a possible option to help us try to incorporate automatic qualification.

I'm way ahead of the game here. I don't want to suggest that this is just

around the corner or this is something we've talked about a lot. I'm saying as a division that it's probably not impossible to think that that might happen or at least that might be an idea that's considered in light of all of this discussion. Our objective is not to restrict anything. We want to make our championships as good as they can possibly be. That's why all of us spend so much time doing the work that we do. We're trying to be creative. We're trying to find a way of accommodating this principle that many of us are very much in favor of and maintaining the integrity of the tournament, while maintaining spots for independents, strong conference members and so on and so forth. As we've said many times, it's a work in progress. These are things that are developing.

Ira Zeff (Blackburn College): I'm president of the St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. I'd like to speak to the point about in-season competition. That's been one of the premises that the Presidents Council and the other groups that have worked with this concept have gone on. I think it's a very important concept.

We have gone away from the concept of our conferences and the rivalries that we have with the teams in our conferences. Most of us choose to belong to a conference for a variety of philosophical reasons. In the system that we're dealing with now, the committees that choose the teams that participate in a championship are going on who you play and are telling us to travel four, six or eight hours away to play the appropriate teams so you can judge who's the best team and who's not the best team.

That goes against most of our philosophies of how much money we want to spend to travel and how much time we want our student-athletes away from our campuses. I think the only way that we can really put things in perspective is to go back to in-season play, make our conferences the most important point of our seasons and reward the championship team of those conferences with that automatic bid. Thank you.

Mr. Galaris: Not to belabor the point about basketball, but I'd like to point out that that's probably one of the issues that's most often mentioned among the membership. As you know, under the guise of restructuring, basketball was cut back from 64 to 48, fully funded. I'd like to point out, Dan, and I think you're aware of this because we've had some of this discussion before, that that action taken under the guise of restructuring was in direct opposition to what the membership voted when we did that survey five or six years ago.

We might want to do another survey of the membership about the play-in concept. I don't know how the membership would vote today. I know how it voted a few years ago. If memory serves correctly, about 86 percent of the membership supported paying its own way in the first round in basketball.

Steve Miller (Cornell College): I've got a question regarding the principles. With a conference needing seven members to qualify for automatic qualification, why was seven the number arrived on since we are working toward representation for 1-to-8 or 1-to-12 as a working ratio? I'm in favor of the automatic qualifier, but it would seem the criteria for a conference champion being automatically selected should be higher than what the national ratio is.

Am I correct in thinking this principle? Then would that apply to all sports and not just basketball, where you've got a lot of the conversation about, but the 1-to-8 ratio and the automatic qualification principle we're discussing would apply to every sport in which team championships are conducted?

Mr. Bridges: It would apply to strictly to team sports at this point. During

this next year, another charge that we have is to start looking at participation opportunities in the individual and team sports. This principle, if adopted, may apply there as well. But at this time, we're only talking about the traditional team sports and applying it to that. Walter wants to respond to the first part of your question.

Mr. Johnson: We arrived at the number "seven" actually from an average. Seven is not the average. Actually, it was like 8.2 or 8.4. We took the total number of teams and divided it by the number of conferences. We came up with 8.2 or 8.4. I don't remember exactly what the number was.

When we looked at that, the question was does that allow for enough at-large berths? The idea was maybe we could reduce it to six to try to take into consideration. Again, this flexibility with the at-large berths and seven seemed to be a good compromise. That's how we got to seven, but it initially started off as an average. We felt the average was really a bit too high, so the compromise was seven.

Donald Harnum (Susquehanna University): I come the Middle Atlantic Conference, which has 16 members. We have two, eight-team leagues. Needless to say, we would support the concept of having two automatic qualifiers for two leagues of seven or more members. Unfortunately, if this did not pass, we would have to struggle with breaking up our conference to form two conferences. We'd certainly prefer not to do that. We think we have a terrific conference as it is. We think that's a reasonable approach to teams that have that many members in their conference.

On the issue of postseason tournaments, in lots of sports that seem to be developing, I've always been opposed to postseason tournaments. I think they spring up from this fatalistic view that many of us as coaches have.

I've got a good team, but if we stub our toes through the year, I want a second shot at winning this thing. I think that's part of the mentality. Of course, the other one is money. The conferences have used these postseason tournaments to earn money to run their conferences. I don't think postseason tournaments have sprung up at all for the benefit of the student-athlete.

I think the automatic qualifier will cause all of us to rethink the issue of postseason tournaments if we've only got one shot at getting one. This again may emphasize in-season play, which I think would be a healthy thing.

Mr. Bridges: Thank you. We're running low on time. President McCray has asked me to cut this off after these three speakers. We'll cut it off there and I'll ask anybody on the panel if they'd like to clarify anything or make any last comments.

Ted Hurwitz (City University of New York Athletic Conference): One of the points makes me think that it's really a philosophy statement. When I did appeal our loss of automatic qualification for the women, I spoke to one of the committee members. Their philosophy was that their eighth team in their conference was better than my first team in my conference, so they deserved to go.

I'm willing to understand this type of philosophy, although it is not mine and I feel it's not Division III's. If we did go to the 64-team tournament, which for the past couple years I've tried to champion, I think you could do both.

You could have the inclusion and the participation for some of the "have-not" conferences and still come out with a national champion who has earned it because of their superior talent. Thank you.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): I'd like to make a couple of comments, offer some suggestions and then ask some questions.

First of all, I'd like to thank the Championships Committee for its good work in providing this forum for us to offer some input.

I believe that in theory the concept of guaranteed automatic qualification for conference champions may be appropriate in Division III. But since this has the potential for changing the definition of national championship competition, it is important that we fully understand what these changes represent. While the Division III philosophy indicates that primary emphasis is to be on regional, in-season competition and conference championships, it seems that much of Division III's time of late has focused on national championship opportunities.

We have seen national championship selection shift from an attempt to involve the most competitive teams in the nation to an attempt to involve the most competitive teams in a region. We are now considering another shift to involving the most competitive team in a conference.

Perhaps these changes are appropriate for Division III. In determining that, I believe that it is important for us to fully explore the ramifications. Increased access for conference champions decreases access for others. With limited spots in a bracket, some of the most competitive teams in a sport may not have an opportunity to participate in the national championship if all qualifying conferences, regardless of competitiveness, are guaranteed a berth.

Depending on the size of a bracket, the number of qualifying conferences and number of nonqualifying conference institutions and independents, a top-20 team that finishes second or third in a very competitive qualifying conference may not have an opportunity to participate in the national championship. I suggest that the membership specifically address the question of whether guaranteed access for conferences is more important than access for the most competitive teams in a region or nationally.

Principle No. 2 allows for nonqualifying conferences to be combined with independents. Thus, one nonqualifying conference could have several members selected and there could be no independents selected, although one of the guiding principles indicates that there will be equitable access for independents. This could not only produce more slots for nonqualifying conferences than qualifying conferences, but also reduce the number of independents that are selected. Independents typically have a more difficult task in putting together a regular-season schedule and should not be further disenfranchised.

The stated goal at the top of the document of providing equitable access for independent institutions and in Principle No. 2 of providing proportional berths for independents may be negatively impacted by selection of nonqualifying conference members in the same pool with independents. I suggest that independents and nonqualifying conferences be separated during consideration for selection. If qualifying conferences are to be guaranteed one slot, with no guarantee and possibly little opportunity for more than one team to be selected, I suggest that nonqualifying conferences should be allowed no more than one team until a 1-to-8 or 1-to-7 ratio for independent and nonqualifying conferences has been realized. Then all remaining teams can be considered for at-large berths.

Questions that I would like to follow up on: Earlier, reference was made to the 1-to-7 ratio. We have used 1-to-8 to determine the size of our brackets. It appears that using a 1-to-7 ratio results in fewer spots being available for independents, for nonqualifying conferences and for at-large selections.

I would ask that you reconsider whether 1-to-7 really is the right ratio. In our philosophy statement, we indicate that championships should provide access for deserving students. I ask that we try to define deserving students. Are those deserving students ones who have qualified on the playing field or are they ones who have qualified through a conference championship that may not be available to all other students?

Earlier, the comment was made that this provides a more objective means for selection. I think that's true in some instances. I think that's a plus. One of the criticisms we frequently hear about the selection process is that it's too subjective. But please keep in mind that for nonqualifying conferences and for independents, there still will be a subjective selection process. I would ask that you do what you can to try to make that process as objective as possible.

Lastly, I would ask you to ensure that the independents and nonqualifying conferences have a voice in the decision-making process. I'm interested in how many independents are going to be represented in the committees that are going to be making these recommendations. I don't know what that breakdown is on the Management Council or the Presidents Council. I believe that most of the speakers this afternoon have been representatives of conferences. I ask that independents and nonqualifying conferences be given the same consideration. Thank you.

Joyce Wong (University of Rochester): My question centers on Bullet No. 4 in terms of conferences must sponsor a minimum of three men's and three women's team sports. Has there been any consideration to what you mean by sponsor? Does sponsor mean seven teams competing in the same ratio or can a conference want to qualify only in one of the team sports and just offer competition in three men's and three women's sports at a differing level than what they would do?

Mr. Bridges: The number seven means you have to have seven in your conference who are eligible for that championship and who do participate in that sport. I'm not sure I understood completely. If I'm not answering it, please come back. Can a conference opt out of automatic qualification, is that essentially what you're asking?

Ms. Wong: Suppose a conference were to qualify only in the sport of men's and women's basketball. They have seven playing members that allow them that qualification. Yet, there are two more women's sports, field hockey and lacrosse, but only three or four members of that particular conference play that sport.

What do you mean by sponsor? They can sponsor men's and women's lacrosse in that conference, but at a differing level than they sponsor what they wish to qualify for.

Mr. Bridges: I think our intention was that you had to have a certain number of schools participating in those other three men's sports and three women's sports, not necessarily qualifying. That hasn't been defined at this point, what we mean by that level.

That's a very good question. We do need to define what level we're talking about when we say you have three other men's sports and three other women's sports. That's something else we need to work on. Thank you.

Just to conclude, I would like to point out that this has been a rather difficult process, even getting to the point where we are now. The point, though, that's most important is that the concept seems to be very consistent with Division III philosophy. We certainly understand the other concerns about

access for independents, access for strong at-large institutions, that sort of thing. So we do have some information. We thank you for your input. We can go back to work and probably next year at this time we'll be discussing this again. That's not to suggest that you won't be contacted mid-year. I'm sure you will. We will get some more feedback from you as ideas develop and as the concept does take shape.

Mr. Hurwitz: Is it possible to have a straw vote of the membership in terms of the 64-team tournament in Division III basketball?

Mr. Bridges: No. No, I'm sorry.

Mr. Hurwitz: We did with football.

Mr. Bridges: Pardon me?

Mr. Hurwitz: We did with football. We said five weeks. That was to the Management Council and the Presidents Council.

Mr. Bridges: I will answer this very specifically. The basketball issue is not really on the table at this time. That may be reconsidered when we finish our business. That's what I suggested and hinted at earlier. Once we take care of business in terms of our team sports that we've done so far in terms of enhancement, evening out access across the board, once we've taken care of looking at the access issue for individual team sports, then we may come back around to reexamining the issues of further expansion in various sports and that sort of thing. But that's not something that the Championships Committee has been charged to deal with at this time. Quite frankly, the Management Council and presidents, at least it's my impression, are not interested in entertaining that at this time.

Once again, that's not to say that we won't. I fully expect that this division will come back and reexamine some of those issues in light of automatic qualification, in light of these other concerns, but at this time, we're not prepared to do that.

Lastly, before President McCray gives us a break, I do want to acknowledge the members of the Championships Committee. My colleagues on this committee are incredibly talented and very committed to all of Division III and making the championships as good as they can possibly be.

The ones who are present on the dais: Bob Williams, Swarthmore College, is on the very end; Sheila Wallace-Kovalchik is next to Bob; then John Biddiscombe. Working this way, Walter Johnson, North Central; Larry Schiner, Jersey City State; and Bridget Belgiovine over here, who's done just about everything, but she's also on the Championships Committee. Please join me in congratulating my colleagues on a job well done. (Applause)

Mr. McCray: Thank you, Dan and committee members. This has been an interesting two-hour session, one that I hope you have learned a great deal, as have we. We heard some very important points. These were developed fully for all of us by a group of volunteers who are committed to this Association and to the philosophy of Division III.

Several weeks ago, I wrote your chancellor or your president hoping that your chancellor or president would attend this meeting, and many have. Many have not. In that letter, I said to your chancellor or your president that I hear from many of you, and that's good. I hope that I continue to hear from you both by phone and e-mail and by letter, but it may be even more important or equally important to me that I hear from your president or your chancellor. As important as it is that I get a message from you, it's very, very important that from the Presidents Council perspective we understand how your chief executive feels about these issues. So I would urge you, to the degree

that you can, make it possible for your chief executive to know how you feel and make sure that those feelings get translated by the chief exec in some form to us at the Presidents Council. We are a representative body. We want to listen to what those we represent have to say.

This has been a good debate. I think it's healthy. I think it's characteristic of the very best in Division III. I have felt like I was in the midst of a faculty meeting. That's sometimes very good and sometimes not, but the end result is always very healthy.

We're going to take a break, but I want us back here because we have another very important topic—discussion of Title IX and gender equity. Therefore, we're going to break now and reconvene in exactly 10 minutes.

[The delegates recessed from 3:35 to 3:50]

TITLE IX AND GENDER EQUITY FORUM

Mr. McCray: Our final discussion topic today is one that demands our attention. Publicity related to Title IX and to gender equity has been especially pronounced most recently, in part because of the 25th anniversary of Title IX.

Most of that discussion continues to focus on the status of Title IX and gender equity in Division I. This focus is dangerous, however, because it can lead those of us in Division III into a false sense of security and cause us to conclude erroneously that significant equity issues do not exist in our division or that somehow we are immune from legal scrutiny in this area. An important first step is simply to discuss Title IX and gender equity from a Division III perspective.

At this point, I would like to introduce Janet Justus. Janet is director of education outreach for the NCAA and the Association's point person regarding Title IX and gender equity. I have heard Janet speak on numerous occasions and can tell you that she has an outstanding understanding of this very complex and challenging issue. Janet will lead us in this discussion and introduce the rest of her panelists. Janet, our thanks to you for the session today. Janet Justus.

Janet M. Justus (NCAA Staff): Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. It's a pleasure to be here. There is a lot of delegates still here. That shows your commitment to this topic because it's very late in the day. I want to thank Dan Dutcher for getting this organized. I appreciate that, although I am not going to be the person to talk very much. I'm going to have a few expert panelists to help us through 45 minutes or so to talk about a variety of issues, but particularly the topic of gender equity as it relates to Title IX and also in the context of the work of the Committee on Women's Athletics.

I'm going to introduce everyone and then we'll begin. The first speaker down at the end of the table to my right is Dan DiBiasio. He is president of Wilmington College. Val Bonnette is next to him. Val is President of Good Sports, Inc. She is also a Wilmington graduate, which was not really what we planned, but that's very nice that it worked out that way. She's been a senior program analyst at the Office for Civil Rights in Washington, D.C., for more than 15 years. During the past four years, she has been a consultant on the law of Title IX and compliance issues for universities and colleges, particularly as it relates to intercollegiate athletics. Next to her, as I'm sure you all know, is Dick Rasmussen. Dick is a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics. He is also a member of the Council. He will speak to some of the issues of gender equity and how it looks today in terms of Division

III's statistics. Next to Dick is Linda Moulton, who is athletics director at Clark University. She is also a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics, and a member of the NCAA Council. She will report on some of the efforts and initiatives of the committee. With that, I think we'll begin. Thank you. Dan.

Dan DiBiasio (Wilmington College, Ohio): Thank you, Janet. Good afternoon, everyone. It is a pleasure to be here this afternoon and to offer some brief remarks about Title IX and gender equity, two very important and in some respects very different issues related to intercollegiate athletics.

With Title IX and gender equity as the foreground issues of this panel, I actually spent some time thinking about what might be placed in the background as a way of providing us with a context in which to understand the contemporary importance of these issues. I think one option would be to have us view these topics against a backdrop of compliance reviews and lawsuits. You know as well as I do that such regulatory and legal battles have appeared with disturbing frequency during the last 25 years during the history of Title IX. As a matter of fact, this was driven home to me perhaps in a very good way a few years ago when I attended a Title IX seminar. We were assembled in a packed house of athletics administrators and institutional representatives. A speaker took the podium to begin an address. The speaker was an attorney, primarily a plaintiffs' attorney, and looked out at us and said it was good to see so many potential defendants in the audience.

These compliance reviews and lawsuits range from the easily resolved to the painfully protracted, extending all the way to the Supreme Court, so I think the color of this particular litigious background could probably be various shades of brown. Another option would be to consider the background framed by the athletics events that occurred in this city about a year-and-a-half ago.

Of course, I'm referring to the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. More than any other Olympiad, the Atlanta games demonstrated the across-the-board prominence of America's women athletes. We witnessed U.S. college graduates, college students and college-bound students in peak performances. Especially noteworthy were the triumphs of the women's basketball, soccer and softball teams. So the color of this background is obviously a mixture of gold and silver and bronze. I'd like to lift up the voice of one of those athletes to really make this point. Karen Gabarra, who was a member of the 1996 gold medal women's U.S. soccer team and is currently the soccer coach at the U.S. Naval Academy, had this to say about that experience: "Everything about being a female athlete was positive. There were no negatives." I'm looking forward to the day when I can say something similar about being a college president.

The nearly three-decade impact of Title IX no doubt contributed to the thrill of those victories. During the years between Title IX's inception in 1972 and 1997, roughly the same period of time between the Munich Games and the Atlanta Games, interscholastic athletics participation for women increased eight times, from about 300,000 participants in 1972 to 2.4 million in 1997.

Participation for women at the intercollegiate level also rose, a threefold increase, from about 32,000 in 1972 to well over 110,000 in 1997. So I prefer this latter background of expanded opportunity and amazing success as the context for considering some of the differences and similarities between Title IX and gender equity.

The basic difference between these two is the difference between a law

and a principle. Title IX, as we all know, is a law intended to ensure participation, access to the benefits of participation and the elimination of discrimination in programs and activities at institutions receiving federal funds. It is a federal regulation and is imbued with legal power and authority.

Gender equity, on the other hand, is not a law. It is a principle, if you will, of reciprocal fairness in men's and women's sports. It is an aspiration. The conditions of gender equity would be present if either sex would find the program of the other acceptable, and trading places would not yield a meaningful deficit to either party and conditions of participation would be considered fair and equitable to the participants. Gender equity is less precisely defined than Title IX, but certainly no less important. As a principle, it is imbued not with legal, but with moral power and authority. Further distinctions arise because Title IX is more procedurally oriented and aims at more practical outcomes, whereas gender equity is more policy oriented and aims at philosophical outcomes.

Although there are differences between Title IX and gender equity, I'd like to focus on what I believe are three common obligations that we in colleges and universities have with respect to both Title IX and gender equity. The three obligations are commitment, cost and collaboration.

Making progress on Title IX and gender equity simply will not happen unless we make a commitment to fully comply with Title IX and to pursue the achievement of gender equity. Presidential leadership in this regard is certainly paramount. Making such a commitment includes publicly asserting that the institution will act reasonably and responsibly in meeting its regulatory requirements and in striving toward the principle of gender equity. It includes educating the campus on the benefits of gender equity and sports participation. Lastly and perhaps most importantly, it includes a commitment to students. With enrollment trends as they've been, this especially is the case as more and more women are entering higher education.

One advantage many Division III institutions have in this regard is that expanding athletics opportunity is a way to positively influence enrollment and retention. In our case at Wilmington College, the recent addition of men's and women's swimming and women's golf reflects this awareness.

A second obligation is cost. Compliance has a cost. Like all cost issues, it must be weighed against other institutional priorities. To get a handle on the cost of compliance requires that athletics not be isolated as an administrative unit and be more integrated into campus decision-making processes. In addition, compliance and gender equity cost considerations need to be linked to institutional planning and budget activities.

A third obligation is collaboration. We all face the challenge posed by Title IX and gender equity. Likewise, we all can realize the benefits of expanding athletics opportunities for women. So often, it seems so many of us pursue these challenges in isolation. Why don't we work together more often and more effectively? Well, I think some are.

Promising forms of collaborations are taking shape. At least 10 athletics conferences have voluntarily made collaborative decisions impacting gender equity. Some have agreed to add the same sport. Others have conducted joint Title IX workshops. In other divisions, conferences have agreed to cost-cutting measures as well as adopted common participation ratios.

The three issues of commitment, cost and collaboration will be high on our agenda as we face Title IX compliance now and in the future. This summer, for example, President Clinton signed an executive order asking all depart-

ments to step up enforcement of Title IX. He announced that action at the ceremony he hosted at the White House to commemorate the 25th anniversary of Title IX. So more attention will be paid.

Complying with Title IX and achieving gender equity won't be easy, but few things that are worthwhile are ever easy. I was reminded recently of just how worthwhile compliance is as I followed the career of one of our women athletes whose name is Stacy Williams. Stacy was a three-sport athlete at Wilmington College and a three-time all-American soccer player who graduated in 1997 with a 3.9 grade-point average. She was named NCAA/Ohio Woman Athlete of the Year in 1997 and one of the 10 finalists for Women of the Year. Being with Stacy and her parents at the Women of the Year banquet this fall was a thrill for all of us, but the really good part of the story was what I learned about Stacy's career aspirations. She told me she wanted to be an athletics director. How many women would have set that goal in pre-Title IX days?

I'd like to close by quoting what Janet already told you was a quote from a Wilmington College graduate, Valerie Bonnette. Part of the reason I picked the quote is so that I could have inserted that in case Janet hadn't, but also because it speaks so directly and so powerfully to this point. In an article titled "Title IX at 25," Valerie wrote the following: "The progress for women has been tremendous, and it will continue in athletics. Every two years, next year in the winter, then two years later in the summer, we will be treated to the latest rounds of impressive performances of our country's women athletes and yet more testimony why equal opportunity cannot be denied, and the reason is Title IX." We are on the right track. Let's stay there, but let's accelerate. Thank you.

Ms. Justus: Thank you, Dan. That was a nice segue into our next speaker's presentation. Val.

Val Bonnette: Thank you again. It's good to see you again, and, Dan, thank you. As an alumnus of Wilmington College, I can tell you that we're thrilled that Dan is leading the college these days. I hear wonderful things from everybody on campus.

On Saturday, I spent about 20 minutes going over the accommodation of interests and abilities. Today is the five-minute sound bite version of interests and abilities and some information on coaching, fund-raising and donations.

The interests and abilities bit might be a little repetitive for those of you who heard this on Saturday, but I thought it would be helpful for some of your CEOs to hear it.

The accommodation of interests and abilities is the issue that was the focus of the Brown University case. It is the focus of all the court cases of the 1990s. It is the most important issue with which to comply under Title IX. It is, in civil rights parlance, the access issue, the provision that requires equal opportunity to participate in the program. The other 12 areas that happen under Title IX deal with equal treatment once you're in the program. Janet tells me there's a one-page list of 13 program components that's being passed around. When you see that list, you can see how extensive Title IX's coverage is. The accommodation of interests and abilities is just the second thing on that list. There has been much misinformation about the accommodation of interests and abilities. Men's teams are being cut and men's opportunities are being limited because people think proportionality is the only way to comply. The fact of the matter is that under Title IX there is no need to

even consider limiting men's opportunities unless women's opportunities are already discriminatorily limited.

The under-representation of women in the athletics program is not by itself a compliance problem under Title IX. What makes the under-representation a problem is if there is also a women's sport that you could be offering based on interest, ability and available competition, but that you are not offering.

Let's quickly go through the three-part test you've heard about. It comes under this issue of the accommodation of interests and abilities. It works this way. The first test, proportionality, looks at participation proportionate to enrollment. Basically, if 52 percent of your full-time undergraduates are women, and that's the population that's used, then 52 percent or somewhere close to that of your participants should also be women. You count individuals who are on the team as of the first date of competition. You also count them every time they're on a team, so those individuals who are on a fall sport team and a spring sport team get counted twice. Somebody on cross country, indoor and outdoor track gets counted three times. The idea is that you're making the opportunities available, so they get counted.

Now, the real question is, how close to enrollment do you have to be? That's undefined. There is no definite answer to that. Some of you have heard of a 5-percentage point variance. There is no legal standard there. That is an out-of-court settlement that has been determined in the NOW case versus the California State University System. Five percentage points is what they're using, but that's not a legal standard adopted by the federal government. The federal government issued a clarification in January 1996 that suggests a much narrower standard is required. But again, it's going to be dependent on a case-by-case basis, so there is no nice numerical goal for you. I suggest at the very outside 5 percentage points. I suggest getting a lot closer than that if you can.

In terms of the second test—a history and continuing practice of program expansion for the under-represented sex—it was created in the late 1970s, as was this three-part test. Lots of schools complied with that test in the late 1970s because lots of schools had recently added teams when the statute was passed in 1972, so this was an easy way for schools to comply. During the 1980's, schools stopped adding teams for a variety of reasons. Now that we're in the 1990s, a lot of schools have not added women's teams for many years. At this point in time, they cannot meet the second test. It may be at some point in the future—if you add some teams now—that you would be judged as meeting this test. I have to say I was thrilled to hear that Wilmington has added men's and women's swimming and women's golf. I am familiar with Wilmington's program at this point in time, and I'm pleased to say that they're meeting not just one of these tests, but two of these three tests. In terms of schools in general, however, most schools cannot meet Test 2 at this point.

The third test, which is probably the most misunderstood, determines if you fully and effectively accommodate the under-represented sex. This means offering every sport for women—it's women who are usually under-represented—for which there's interest, ability and available competition. The federal government is going to look at interest in your on-campus programs and also your feeder program. They're going to look at your club sports programs, intramural programs, physical education programs, and they're going to look at high-school participation in the areas where you recruit. They're going to look for substantive evidence of interests. From there, as far as available

competition, your normal competitive region is not just your conference members. It's the geographical region where your conference members are and also any other institutions against which you routinely compete.

Our experience with Division III clients is that some schools have competitive regions that are a 175-mile radius from campus. Some, it's more like 300 miles. You identify the schools in that area that are offering the sport that you're considering adding and see if there's enough competition for that sport.

Those schools that are not meeting any of these three tests are faced with a decision. If they're not meeting any of the three tests, it comes down to do you add a woman's team to meet either Test 2 or Test 3? If you decide you cannot do that, then you've effectively decided that proportionality is your compliance method. You can achieve proportionality in any number of ways. Eliminating teams is one way. It's not something we ever recommend to anybody. Roster management, which you've probably all heard about, is an issue that some schools are considering in which walk-on men's opportunities are cut back and women's walk-on opportunities are added to the extent it's reasonable for their teams. They achieve proportionality that way.

I think roster management is probably preferable to eliminating teams. That's the quick version of interests and abilities.

On to coaching. Three factors get looked at here. We at Good Sports, in case you didn't get the impression already, deal with analysis of information. We leave the moral issues to the CEOs and leaders of your various groups.

In coaching, there are three factors that are looked at—availability of coaches, assignment or qualifications of coaches and coaches' compensation. The availability of coaches comes down to several things such as numbers of coaches to the teams. If you've got three soccer coaches for your men's team, do you have three soccer coaches for your women's team? If you don't, it doesn't mean there's a problem. Maybe you're offsetting that somewhere else in the program. Maybe you've got three men's soccer coaches, two women's soccer coaches, but you've got two women's tennis coaches and one men's tennis coach. You can kind of balance it in your program. But for numbers of coaches, check your similar sports first, then check your dissimilar sports to see if you've got coaching to the appropriate level for the sport.

Length of contract. Do male coaches have 12-month contracts while women's coaches have nine-month contracts? This is a common problem. Then you look at full-time coaches, half-time coaches. Are women's coaches teaching exercise physiology and kinesiology courses while your men's coaches are teaching things like racquetball? This all goes to the availability of coaches.

"Assignment" is years of experience. There's a very simple analysis dealing with average years of experience, but that's not the beginning and end-all. You want to look at the success of your coaches and the success of the teams. You don't decide that students are being discriminated against if they're winning your conference championship every year and going on to regional competition because the coach of the team has only got three years of experience. Obviously, it goes beyond simple numbers.

Compensation of coaches is a different issue under athletics than it is under employment. The compensation of coaches under the athletics provisions of Title IX deal with benefits to students. It's the students being protected under the athletics provisions, not the coaches. So the simple analysis that's done in compensation is are your total dollars for coaches' salaries divided proportionately to participation? Even if they're not, it doesn't mean

there's a problem. If coaches are equally available and equally qualified for male and female students, then there is no compensation issue from the students' perspective. Basically, it comes down to if I am a female athlete, I cannot claim that I'm being discriminated against if my coach is equally available and equally qualified because he or she is getting a terrible salary. There's no discrimination against me as a student. The coach may have an employment claim under Title IX, and that's a separate issue altogether. That can take a separate conference, frankly. Ellen Vargas from the EEOC was going over the new guidance for that just yesterday morning. It was an excellent session.

Common problems of Division III include more dual coaching assignments in the women's program than the men's program. This becomes particularly a problem when you've got dual head-coaching assignments. It not only affects the availability of coaches, it affects the scheduling of games and practices in your nontraditional seasons for your sports and it affects your coach's ability to recruit. So if it's happening more so in one program than the other, it's a compliance concern. Another common problem, particularly in Division III, is that lots of your coaches are teaching. If your women's coaches are teaching more substantive courses, this is affecting their availability to the students. Women's teams missing a second or a third assistant coach that your men's teams has or a higher percentage of your men's coaches with longer contracts—12-month contracts as opposed to nine-month contracts—are the common red flags for you to look for.

On to fund-raising and donations. We at Good Sports don't usually provide specific recommendations unless someone asks us. We analyze, we inform, we provide the range of options. We figure it's your school and you can figure out what's best for you, but some advice on donations. Never, ever turn down a donation. Certainly not for Title IX reasons.

There is enough flexibility under Title IX that any imbalance in benefits caused by a donation can be offset somewhere else in the program and may be offset even if you don't know it. There's also enough flexibility under Title IX so that even if something creates a serious problem this year, you can offset it next year. You have that type of flexibility under Title IX. It doesn't mean if right this minute it creates an imbalance that you're automatically in violation of federal law. You've got time to take care of it. The approach under Title IX is an overall approach, comparing the total women's program to the total men's program. It's not sport to sport. So, in other words, if men's basketball gets a specific benefit, it doesn't automatically mean women's basketball needs to get the same benefit. It might go to women's soccer or some other women's team.

The good news about donations and fund-raising is that most Title IX issues are not dollar-for-dollar amounts. There are certain areas where there are exceptions. Scholarships is one. Coaches salaries, and recruitment dollars are others. There's a target under recruitment that total dollars be proportionate to participation, but otherwise the question really is what does the money buy? You need to look at the specific benefit. I'll give you an example of a question that was put to me. A Division I baseball coach of a very popular program wanted to spend some serious fund-raising dollars to add a section of seats to the baseball stadium. This was going to cost tens of thousands of dollars. The school was asking me if they needed to spend \$50,000 or \$60,000 in the women's program. Well, there wasn't any similar concern in the women's program. No women's teams needed any similar sort of ben-

efit. There was nothing to spend it on specifically. What the women's teams needed were more certified coaches traveling with them on away events, more sports information staff traveling with them to away events to make it comparable to what was happening in the men's program, but you simply reassign staff. There wasn't a need to spend \$60,000 to accomplish compliance there.

The policy on fund-raising is that the institution is always responsible for providing equitable benefits, regardless of donations or fund-raising efforts. Disparate benefits for male and female athletes cannot be blamed on differences in fund-raising successes of coaches or donations to the program. The point under Title IX is to not have the popularity of a sport or a coach be the excuse for disparate benefits. Some institutions put all their fund-raised dollars into a general fund. Some let the coaches keep it for their specific teams. I have yet to see a school that lets coaches keep it for their specific teams create serious Title IX problems. If there is any Title IX concern created by that, it's always very minor. I would suggest that it's probably okay for your coaches to keep their fund-raised dollars.

A Division III baseball coach a couple of months ago called me up and said he and his student-athletes wanted to fund-raise so that they could take a coach bus on their spring break trip rather than drive vans. He wanted to know if this was a problem. I said in the scheme of your total program, you're probably talking about one away trip out of a possible 100 or 150 away trips. It is not a major part of your travel and per diem benefits for students. So if it is a concern, it's a minor concern. But he was also telling me that the student-athletes were doing a major part of the fund-raising. When student-athletes are doing fund-raising, the more they do that, the more it is seen in that way. If the students are paying for benefits for themselves, the school is not obligated to offset those benefits.

The one thing about students fund-raising for their teams, quite simply, is to make sure that if you as an institution know there's an easy fund-raising possibility on your campuses—sometimes it's working the concession stands at the football games—to make sure that's not more available to men's teams than women's teams or vice-versa. That would be your involvement if students are involved in fund-raising.

I've probably exceeded my time on the sound-bite version. I'll turn it over to Dick to carry on. Thank you. (Applause)

Ms. Justus: Thank you, Val. I failed to introduce Dick properly. Dick is the executive secretary of the University Athletic Association. Dick Rasmussen. Thank you.

Richard A. Rasmussen (University Athletic Association): Thank you, Janet. I'd like to talk about some of the tools that we have available for monitoring compliance with Title IX and gender-equity issues, promoting compliance and how we understand those issues on our campus. I'd like to talk about those three areas.

The first tool is the NCAA gender-equity study. Highlighting some of the aspects of the results of that study, the second round of which was completed last year, are the requirements of the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act and how they affect our campuses and the balance in our programs. There's also a few comments about the EEOC guidelines that Val mentioned earlier on coaches' compensation. The NCAA gender-equity study was a recommendation that came out of the work of the Gender-Equity Task Force a

number of years ago. It's completed once every five years. Last year in 1997, we completed the second cycle. The first one occurred in 1992.

One of the other things that happened in that effort two years ago was that the collection of data for that was combined with the reporting requirements for the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act. The two complemented each other very, very well. With efforts from the Committee on Women's Athletics and the research staff at the NCAA, one of the things we were able to do was combine two significant data-collection processes. Hopefully, we've saved some of our institutions some effort in that regard.

I'd like to make a few comments about some of the specific results from the 1997 study and relate them back a little bit to the 1992 study. There is an area that seems to be the biggest problem on a national scale model. Granted, these are all averages, and how accurate they are from institution to institution is open to interpretation, but in the gross sense, they point out some things that we may want to be conscious of. If you look at the breakdown in institutional enrollments overall, you see that on most campuses on the national level, 55 percent of our students are women, whereas only 38 percent of our athletics participants in 1997 were women. That's an issue we need to look at. That comes back to the whole issue of the participation ratios. Once you get past that, as a whole, our division does very well in most regards in terms of operating expenses.

The breakdown between men's and women's programs mirrors very well the participation ratios at 63 percent and 37 percent versus 62 and 38 percent. For recruiting expenses, that's not as true. This maybe points back toward the difference between the institutional enrollment ratios and the participation ratios.

There are more dollars going to recruiting in men's sports. Part of that's a product of history. Some of it may be due to the nature of some sports, but that's an issue for individual campuses to look at as well. In terms of salaries, when you look at head-coaches' salaries, it appears that on the whole, institutions are trying to be as aggressive as they can in seeking out good candidates for women's coaching positions. The percentages there in terms of the participation ratios for student-athletes are actually a little better on the women's side than on the men's side. That is not the case with assistant coaches' salaries. But if you pick that discrepancy apart, 72 percent of the dollars are going to coaches of men's teams as opposed to women's teams. The major difference there has to do with two sports. One is football and the other is men's ice hockey.

I would suggest that the difference there is that your first or second principal assistant coaches in a sport such as football tend to be more like head coaches sometimes in terms of their duties and so on. They are more comparable to head coaches than assistant coaches. That accounts for some of that discrepancy.

In terms of looking at the numbers of full-time versus part-time coaches in the report, the percentages between men's and women's teams broke down pretty closely as well. The percentages of coaches that were reported as full time for the men was 44 percent and for the women was 42 percent. That is pretty well balanced. I would offer one caution, though, in that regard. One of the things that the gender-equity study probably doesn't do as good a job as it could with is reflecting the number of multiple appointments with regard to men's and women's coaches. There may be some suggestion that, although this is reporting coaching positions, if you were actually doing head counts,

you'd be looking more at women's coaches than the men's coaches in terms of multiple appointments.

I have two other charts to look at that have to do with the comparisons and what kind of progress that's been made between the 1992 study and the 1997 study. In terms of athletics participation, there wasn't a whole lot of change on the average with the women's programs. Looking at the two smaller bars there, those numbers have stayed roughly the same on average. However, in the men's programs, there's been a slight decrease.

On the operating expense side, things look a little bit different in one regard. There's been an increase in resources being made available to both men's and women's programs. But in the case of the women's programs, while the women's programs are still receiving less than the men's programs, there's been a greater acceleration in the increase in resources being made available to the women's programs. Those are just a few notes with regard to the progress in terms of the results of the gender-equity study.

I'd like to talk about the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act and a few key points with regard to the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act. The EADA requirements were part of the changes to the Higher Education Act, which is actually part of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994. The requirements were designed specifically to make prospective students and prospective student-athletes aware of the commitments of an institution to providing equitable athletics opportunities for its men and women students. That was the intent.

The intent was for that process to serve as a sunshine process in kind of opening up the doors and getting information out to people. The provisions of the EADA apply to all coeducational institutions in higher education that participate in any Title IX Higher Education Act programs like the federal Pell programs, SCOG and other types of programs that have intercollegiate athletics programs.

The requirements beyond the submission of collecting of specific information, which I'm sure you're all aware of, is that institutions must make that information available by October 15 of each year. It has to be easily accessible and provided in a timely fashion. You cannot charge a fee for it. Institutions are required annually to provide a notice to their students that the information exists and that they have a right to see that information.

No federal submission is required and there are no exemptions. If you're an institution of higher education, you have a men's and women's program and you participate in any of the federal-funding programs, you must comply with the specifics of the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act.

There has been a great deal of focus on the information that's come out of this reporting process. There has been a lot of public scrutiny with regard to things like the information that was published in USA Today and on the USA Today Web site. The Chronicle of Higher Education last year published a lot of information about this. The Women's Sports Foundation collected additional information from institutions and issued its report cards and so on. So while our individual institutions may not be getting a lot of requests, this is an issue that's out there and has generated interest. It is something that we need to deal with. It probably is not going to go away.

In terms of the value that I think can be derived from this process, there are a couple of things. One is there's some value in the sunshine effect. This does open things up. It does provide a means for self-study and for evaluation of the programs. It also provides an opportunity to educate various con-

stituencies within our campuses, whether it be key administrators like our presidents, provosts, deans or vice-presidents. It can also be used very well—I'm sure it is being used—by athletics directors, senior woman administrators and faculty athletics reps. It can also help to demystify the situation.

A lot of times difficulty occurs because people make assumptions that this or that's going on. That may not be the case, but by putting that information out there, everybody has equal access to knowledge about the situation and everyone can take ownership of the situation. This information can also be useful in supporting the work of gender-equity committees on campus or could provide an incentive for the formation of a gender-equity committee on campus. More than anything else, I think what the result of this act has been has been the generation of conversations based on some factual information. Not that that information wasn't available, but it's an exercise going through collecting and compiling that information. That requirement is out there now. This is something that's going to be happening on an ongoing basis.

The last area that I wanted to comment on are the EEOC guidelines. These are guidelines that were released in November by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I'd like to speak in more detail about what the guidelines include, not by explaining the guidelines themselves, but what is there. They'll hopefully serve as a means of encouraging people to take a closer look at what's included in this document, because I think it is very useful.

The document is somewhat in response to a growing body of information out there that there is a problem nationally with the differences in compensation between coaches in men's and women's teams. Some of that has come out of the EADA reporting process. It was given pretty wide publicity by the EEOC itself when it was released, which suggests that there's an expectation that institutions should be proactive in dealing with this issue. One of the good things about this is that this is one of the most well-written and most understandable documents I've seen come out of a federal agency. It really is a document that's easy to read. It's very understandable. The examples that they offer are very good examples and are really applicable across all three of our divisions. I would encourage you to look at the document because there's some good that can be derived for any campus using it.

I have a few key points and a few other items with regard to that. The document deals with complaints that would be filed under the provisions of the Equal Pay Act and Title VII, which deals with employment issues, as opposed to Title IX, which deals with the equal treatment of men and women in other ways. The comparisons that are looked at when a complaint is filed are not necessarily comparisons sport to sport, men's basketball coach to women's basketball coach, baseball coach to softball coach. The guidelines encourage investigators to use, if you will, a Title IX approach or principle that entails examining any complaints or in doing a self-study of the program by looking at the entire program as a whole, not just isolated situations.

The types of things they're suggesting institutions look at in comparing positions include four things: Looking to ensure or examining whether in comparing positions equal skill is required of coaches, and that has to do with coaching skills, not the skill of the athletes; whether equal effort is involved in the two positions; whether the responsibilities are equal; and whether similar working conditions exist between the compared positions. That's not to say that in order to comply all of those things have to be equal.

There are differences that are justifiable. They're justifiable if they can be shown that they're based on a seniority system or on a merit system so that earnings are linked to quality or quantity.

For the most part, those three things are not necessarily applicable to coaching in the sense that they are in a lot of businesses or industries, but the fourth area that they suggest looking at are factors other than sex in looking at the differences. The topics that the guidelines cover there have to do with revenue generation, marketplace value, the prior salary, the sex of the athletes coached, experience, ability, educational level and the additional duties of coaches with one caveat that they offer. If you're looking at making a comparison between positions and these factors that exist are actually themselves a result of discrimination, then that's not a valid defense or reason for differences to exist.

That's a brief run-through of what the guidelines include. Copies of those guidelines were available at the Division III administrators' meeting the other day. We passed out a number of those. You can obtain copies from the educational services office at the NCAA. You can also print copies of it directly from the EEOC web site. It's www.eoc.com. It's very easy to find and print out.

In going through each of these areas, they offer a number of examples that are very useful and very applicable to Division III as well as the other divisions. I encourage you to take advantage of that resource. Thank you. (Applause)

Ms. Justus: Thank you, Dick. That was great. Now, we have Linda Moulton, a member of the Committee on Women's Athletics, to speak about the committee, its work and its initiatives in the area of gender equity and Title IX.

Linda S. Moulton (Clark University, Massachusetts): My remarks will be brief. I know it's been a long day for all of us.

I was fortunate to serve on the Division III Restructuring Task Force and have continued this past year on the Management Council throughout the discussions of both of those groups and our planning. Now, we're in the implementation stage.

It's important for you to know that there always has been and is a very strong commitment to equity, not just at the government and the committee structure levels, but in our desire to provide equitable opportunities to our student-athletes.

One of the outcomes of federation, at least from my perspective, has been our ability as a membership to focus on those things that are important to us. Certainly one of the cornerstones of the Division III philosophy has been the fair and equitable treatment of our men and women and giving equitable emphasis to our men's and women's sports.

The mission of the Committee on Women's Athletics is to provide leadership and assistance to the NCAA membership in its efforts to provide those equitable opportunities, fair treatment and respect in all areas of intercollegiate athletics. Implicit in our mission statement are three key areas that we believe are the committee's major responsibilities. First, we're seeking to expand and promote opportunities for women athletes. Second, we're promoting governance, administration and conduct of athletics at the institutional, conference and national levels that are inclusive, fair and accessible to women. Thirdly, we're developing programs and resources that can be of practical use to our membership.

Within each of those three key areas of responsibility, we certainly define our role as one of being multifaceted, from promoting and supporting the

NCAA postgraduate scholarship and internship programs, the NCAA woman of the year, the NCAA CHAMPS/Life Skills program, YES clinics, the national girls sports camp program and the continuation of NCAA funding for the NACWAA/Hers program, to developing strategies and legislation for emerging sports, monitoring the championships needs assessment and the representation of women at the decision-making level at the national office and within the committee structure, a comprehensive NCAA sports-marketing plan for women, holding Title IX seminars, producing the senior woman administrator brochure, achieving gender-equity guidelines and the guidelines for the development of emerging sports.

Our efforts as a committee also include working with a variety of other NCAA committees, organizations and associations that share our commitment to educating and assisting whenever and wherever possible. As part of our educational component, the Committee on Women's Athletics also assists Janet and her office in the continued development of a resource center at the national office. The purpose of the center is to collect and compile information and data on a variety of issues and topics.

We're also working on the development of a speakers' bureau and on a list-server news group that would allow our members to exchange information on a variety of women's sports issues. In addition, the committee is now working on a comprehensive three- to five-year strategic plan. We believe that this plan and the things that we do will provide the necessary guidance for the committee's important and necessary work.

We wanted to leave time for questions. If you have any, I'd like to turn it back over to Janet. (Applause)

Ms. Justus: Thank you, Linda. Thank you, panel. That was a great presentation. It really covered a lot of bases. Are there any questions? Anything for Val? Anything for Dan, Dick, Linda or me? Okay. Let's go to dinner. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. McCray: Our thanks to the panelists. Our thanks to all of you. This has been a terrific day. See you tomorrow morning at 8 in this room.

[The Division III business session was recessed at 5 p.m.]

Tuesday Morning, January 13, 1998

The Division III business session was called to order at 8 a.m.

OPENING REMARKS

Curtis L. McCray (Millikin University): Good morning. Would you take your seats, please? We're ready to begin. Good morning. I'd like to review with you briefly the schedule for this morning. We are scheduled to meet until 11 this morning. Our primary topic will be a presentation and discussion session regarding Division III financial aid regulations. We have set aside approximately two hours for that important topic.

That will be followed by the election of our new Management Council representatives, a very important event that should not take long. We will conclude with an open forum and question-and-answer session. Since our business session is short and travel schedules are a factor, we will not adjourn for a break during this morning's session. That should help make the session productive and cause us to move along as rapidly as possible.

I would now like to introduce Shirley Liddle, chair of the Financial Aid and Awards Committee. Shirley will introduce the rest of the participants.

FINANCIAL AID FORUM

Shirley Liddle (Pennsylvania Athletic Conference): Thank you. I'd like to welcome my colleagues this morning, the last morning of the Convention. I want to thank all of you ahead of time for being attentive listeners.

Yesterday was an interesting day. I found it to be refreshing that everyone was so attentive and so interested in the subjects. This has been a different Convention, as we probably all appreciate, from Conventions in the past. It is a pleasure this morning to be able to introduce the session on financial aid and awards to the Division III membership. I imagine that some of you may have had a similar reaction to this topic that I once had, which is not dissimilar to thoughts about doing one's own income tax. I want you to know that this will be an interesting and educational presentation, with different presenters on each topic, handouts to read and overheads to study.

As you all know, financial aid is an issue that can have far-reaching impact on all of our programs as well as on our respective institutions. The issue of financial aid and awards is a very important topic confronting our division. Financial aid issues are wide ranging and confront virtually all of the institutions in this country. Financial aid decisions in some way impact all aspects of our institutions. It is important that we are clear about the direction we proceed, the decisions we make and the reasons that we make them, for they are essential to the future of Division III.

It is vital that we understand compliance of financial aid legislation. It is important that we understand Division III philosophy regarding the intent of the financial aid legislation. The purpose of our presentation is to provide education regarding compliance of that legislation.

To give everyone a brief perspective on the history of this committee, this is a brand-new committee for Division III. I have had the honor of being on the division-wide Financial Aid Committee for the past several years. I have learned more than I thought I would ever know about financial aid in Division I, which has been most interesting, but not very practical from a Division III standpoint. As we all know, Division I problems or challenges with financial aid are quite different from ours. One thing I am very clear about is that we do not want the financial aid problems that Division I has.

This committee had its first meeting in July, its second in September and here we are before you now. As you can see from the outline, we are presenting a summary of the recent survey that you took, a history of the financial aid legislation and a redefinition of the current financial aid without need legislation, followed by perspectives for future activity.

At this time, I'd like to introduce the members of the Financial Aid Committee. The first presenter will be President Donald Wharton. Don is from Plymouth State. He will discuss the results of the recent December survey, followed by financial aid educational strategies. The second presenter will be Professor Jeff Ankrom. Jeff is a faculty athletics rep at Wittenberg University and has been a previous member of the restructuring committee. The third presenter will be Georgette DeVeres. Georgette is the associate dean and director of financial aid at Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges. The fourth presenter will be Karen Johnson. Karen is an information analyst at Alfred University. Future planning will be presented by Walter Johnson. Walter is the director of athletics at North Central College and a member of the Management Council. Our student-athlete representative is Andrew McPhee from Middlebury College. Two members of the committee are not present today. They are President Brent De Vore of

Otterbein College and Suzanne Schlager, the director of student aid at Franklin and Marshall. Our NCAA staff liaison is Jennifer Heppel. Like all NCAA staff, Jennifer holds a number of positions, but has managed to provide a great deal of assistance to this committee. At this time we'd like to express our appreciation to Jennifer. (Applause)

In summary, I would like to say that my vision for Division III is that financial aid is an important aspect of our programs that needs much careful consideration. It has many variables and wide-ranging impact. The work of this committee has really just begun, but the potential to make decisions that we are all proud of in the future is significant. I believe that the direction this committee is taking is positive, proactive and will enhance the mission of Division III athletics.

Without further ado, I'd like to turn the microphone over to President Wharton, who will present the results of the December financial aid survey.

Donald P. Wharton (Plymouth State College): Good morning. Thank you, Shirley. As Shirley and other colleagues have mentioned, restructuring has given us a unique opportunity to generally focus on our own Division III issues, and certainly, financial aid and awards is a very crucial part of managing our institutions and living out the Division III philosophy. The committee's first business is to ensure that there is ample understanding of financial aid and awards issues by the membership and that we have a mutual common understanding of the regulations that will ensure compliance on our campuses.

With that in mind, this fall we sent you a survey asking you to give us some feedback on those issues that you are most concerned about relative to financial aid, those things that you felt you needed more information about and those things about which perhaps you were unclear in the management of financial aid. So those survey results are the things that have shaped this presentation this morning. You'll notice that three of the top four issues identified by the membership have to do with awards that can be given in excess of need to student-athletes as long as athletics participation is not a criteria. Some of my colleagues on the committee will go over those awards in detail in just a moment.

The third item indicates a widespread interest by the membership in having some continuing education on the whole issue of financial aid and awards by both the committee and by the Association. Later in the program, I will report to you on those efforts. Items 5 through 8 are subjects that you identified and that the committee is prepared to respond and discuss with you during the question-and-answer period at the end of our presentation. Your feedback to the committee has been extremely helpful. We fully intend to continue to respond to your expressed needs relative to the issues of financial aid and awards. All of us are committed to helping Division III get to that common understanding of how financial aid and awards should be managed. When we get there, we will have come a very long way in cementing the Division III philosophy to our actual practice. Thank you.

Jeff A. Ankrom (Wittenberg University): Good morning. I've been given the part of this that I thought at first was going to be kind of deadly boring. But as I went back through the materials on financial aid history, I found that a number of these themes just kept recurring again and again and again. The things that we are about to discuss have been discussed before and will probably keep us busy for some time.

I'm not going to look at the whole history, but I do want to begin by look-

ing at what happened at the 1974 Convention. In 1974, Proposal 15 was passed. Proposal 15 at the 1974 Convention had a number of features. It established the notion that all financial aid will be need-based. A number of institutions, especially smaller liberal arts colleges, have been looking at many different kinds of aid packages. Of course, all of us give merit awards as well as need-based awards in our financial aid packages, but in the past, I think a number of institutions tried to stay committed to the notion that all aid will be need-based. Proposal 15 at the 1974 Convention reasserted that principle.

Also in 1974, Proposal 15 established the idea that all outside aid must be reported. If I'm fortunate enough to win a Kiwanis scholarship, it's my responsibility to report that to the institution where I intend to enroll. It's also incumbent upon the institution to make an effort to try to track those awards. There's a bit of a paradox here because we're supposed to look at the students somewhat blindly as they come in the door. But after they're with us, we have to make an effort to track these kinds of outside awards. These outside aid awards must be reported.

Adjustments to aid packages may also be made. That notion was established in 1974. This is something that has bothered me a little bit lately. I've been on a financial aid and enrollment management committee at Wittenberg. We find that it's not uncommon for students to fax something to us that's got columns that says: "Here's the package I got from so and so. Here's the package I got from so and so. What can you do for me?" I think it's one of the more disturbing features of the financial aid landscape right now. But it is something that is with us, and I think we have to be honest and acknowledge it.

There are many instances when adjustments to aid packages are legitimate. There are changes in family circumstances, divorce, sudden changes in employment and so forth. Those adjustments are certainly legitimate, but in other cases, we know that there are troubling things going on out there.

Also in '74, the principle was established that these academic honor awards could be made in excess of financial need. All of you know that students are required to fill out quite a bit of paperwork to establish their level of need, so that financial aid form that students use actually establishes that figure.

In the Division III financial aid history, in 1975, Proposal 60 established the idea that academic honor awards would be made only to those in the top-20 percent of the class. I wasn't around at that time, but I'm sure that some places probably were extending very broadly the notion of what academic honor is. So this 20-percent figure came into the equation in 1975. Moving to 1978, Proposal 42 incorporated the notion that academic honor awards must be a part of the institution's normal scholarship process. We don't, know everything that was going on at the time, but it is apparent that there was concern about separate processes being used for particular groups of students. I think we all can subscribe to the notion that everything needs to be a part of a common practice used at all institutions.

These academic honor awards also must be awarded independent of athletics interests. That means that as much as possible, the financial aid process, not to mention the admissions process, must be kept separated from athletics interests as much as possible. This is a tricky part of the equation as well because we know that our coaches are very good recruiters for our campuses. They bring students to the door, but as much as possible, it's important to try to remove athletics interests. Coaches know what we're talking

about here from the process of making these financial aid awards. It was also determined in 1978 that the pattern of financial aid had to be consistent with the rest of the student body. So if student-athletes as a group were getting different treatment in their aid packages, this raised a flag.

Now, it is possible that student-athletes as a group might have a different profile. They could, for example, have higher need. But at that time, the notion of a consistent financial aid package was interpreted to mean that student-athletes as a group had to get about the same profile with aid as the rest of the student body.

Let's move on to awards of circumstance. You're going to hear more about those in detail. I'm just giving you the brief historical overview now. I'm going to talk about what those awards of circumstance are. Those could also be given as of 1978 in Proposal 42 in excess of allowable need. They have to be available to all students. They can't be selectively given. They must be granted with no relationship to athletics ability. There can be no quota for such awards. It is not possible to make sure that student-athletes get a certain number of these awards. They must be well publicized by the institution. All financial aid information must be open and available for all students who apply. Again, I'll talk more about that later.

Proposal 57 in 1979 permitted students' athletics ability to receive equal recognition in aid packages for student-athletes as other abilities, for example, music, art and drama, did in packages for other students.

In 1988, that feature of our landscape was changed when we codified and made more consistent the idea of a consistent financial aid package. We'll have more to say about that as we go, but in 1979 we took that step. This is the beginnings of what you now see in the NCAA Manual as Bylaw 15.4.8 and also 15.4.9.

Moving to 1979, Proposal 58 established that awards of circumstance must be granted by the institution and not an outside agency. This is to make sure that financial aid awards are consistently applied. If, for example, a high-school football coach was able to make the decision as to who would get one of these awards, that would be a violation of the principles, policies and philosophy that we seek to embody in our legislation.

In 1980, there were a number of proposals. Proposal 42 would have permitted athletically related financial aid. I think it's very interesting. I actually heard a few people at the end of last year's Convention speculating about this possibility and if people would be open to the notion of doing this. It seemed as somewhat of a shock to me at the time, but maybe I don't know enough history. Just 18 years ago, Proposal 42 at the 1980 Convention would have permitted athletically related financial aid in Division III.

Proposal 43 adopted on-campus employment regulations. You're going to hear more about those in a few moments. The 1981 Convention established a grandfather clause for athletics funds and endowments that had been created prior to January 1, 1979. You probably know that a number of these funds were established and were being given to student-athletes. There's no question that their athletics ability was a factor in the awarding of those funds. Proposal 102 in 1981 grandfathered, in a sense, those funds. The income from those funds could still be used, but only for the general student population. It could not be given specifically to student-athletes.

Proposal 103 tried again to make consistent the idea of a consistent financial aid package. Again, consistency means that student-athletes and non-student-athletes are to be treated the same. That amended Bylaw 15.4.9.

Proposal 44 at the 1987 Convention essentially federated financial aid, allowing each division to determine the maximum amount of aid for its student-athletes. Up to that point, all three divisions pretty much treated financial aid as a single process.

However, the so-called "cost of attendance factor, the cost of attendance regulation remained in place. No division by the NCAA Constitution is ever able to give financial aid above this amount. Cost of attendance is basically tuition, room and board and some other factors that can be added in for books, transportation, et cetera. This was first proposed in 1984. Then, there's an interim. Things started to heat up again in about 1987. Just 10 years ago, the Division III Steering Committee did a survey. The survey results suggested that 60 percent of the respondents believed that athletes received no special consideration in financial aid packaging, so this is a perception about what was.

As to what should be, 92 percent said athletes should not receive special consideration in financial aid packaging. I'll let you interpret the gap yourself. Seventy-three percent said athletics ability should not be considered in aid awards for student-athletes. So going well back in time there's a consistency here. Division III people have believed that athletics ability should play no part in aid packaging.

Moving to the 1988 Convention, Proposal 92 established the notion that athletics staff members would not be allowed to participate in aid recommendations. Of course, they're not allowed to participate in the actual aid award process, but it stops before even that. No participation in aid recommendations. Athletics staff members cannot serve on financial aid committees. Again, when we talk about awards of circumstances a little bit later, we'll talk about the composition of that committee. It would not be appropriate for athletics staff members to serve on those financial aid committees.

Proposition 95 was defeated in 1988. That would have allowed leadership and merit awards in excess of need. These leadership and merit awards have been much, much discussed on our campus. The people in our office feel serious pressure. We hear a lot about a lot of these things. I know the rest of you do as well. At the 1990 Convention, we passed Proposal 51. It allowed what are called nonathletics achievement awards, which again were allowable beyond need. You're going to hear more about those as soon as I'm finished discussing the history.

Proposal 92 at the '91 Convention removed off-campus employment earnings from counting against student-athletes' need during the year of earning. This created a difficult tracking process. Earnings that are gained this year by a student-athlete, enter into the equation essentially next year. They have the effect of causing the student's need in the next year to be adjusted.

At the '93 Convention, Proposal 92 passed. Academic honor awards could include nonacademic criteria. Proposal 93 also passed at the '93 Convention. Proposal 93 established that a committee, not a single individual, composed predominantly of faculty of an academic unit—it could be a department; it could be a school; it could be a division—must select recipients of the nonathletics achievement awards.

That's enough history. The material that I just gave you is not in your packet. If you're interested, I have a Web site that can be found pretty easily. Go to the Wittenberg University home page and weave your way to my page and you can easily download a copy of this presentation.

I'm going to turn it over now to Shirley. If you have questions, there'll be plenty of time later, so save them.

Ms. Liddle: The next section of our presentation is to actually break down the legislation and try to provide more clarity regarding the various awards of financial aid that are made without consideration of need.

I'd like to reiterate to the membership at this time that all institutions in Division III are supposed to forward to the national office a packet of all of their aids for approval by this committee. At this point, I would say that probably a little more than half of the institutions in this room have done that.

I'd like now to turn this over to Georgette DeVeres, who will provide clarification regarding the award that most people seem to have difficulty with—the nonathletics achievement awards. Georgette.

Georgette DeVeres (Claremont McKenna-Harvey Mudd-Scripps Colleges): Good morning. It's been a very interesting process serving on this committee, particularly from the financial aid perspective. I learned quickly serving on this committee that you guys have more regulations than the federal government in some respects. I found that quite interesting. The educational process that all of us will go through when President Wharton walks us through this later is going to be good both for the financial aid offices that you work with on your campuses as well as your own offices.

Before we go through nonathletics achievement awards, we thought it would be helpful to review types of awards that can be given without consideration of need. I'm going to cover the nonathletics achievement awards. You're going to hear more about awards of circumstance and the academic honors award from Jeff. But we also wanted to highlight that loans are types of financial aid that can be given without regard to need.

Jeff has already referenced on-campus employment in terms of how that has been changed in its calculation in the financial aid package. He also mentioned briefly aid from other outside resources. The nonathletics achievement award packet is at your desk. It's the lavender handout that was distributed earlier. We're going to walk through this particular award, and I'm going to give you examples of how these awards are approved easily by the committee and how awards might cause some problems in our review.

The first thing in the lavender handout that I want to bring to your attention is actually the form itself. This form must be completed on your campus by the financial aid director. Each nonathletics achievement award needs to be listed per form. You have to answer the four questions that describe the award. It's pretty self-explanatory in terms of what you need to review to answer the four questions. I wanted to bring to your attention that this form must be completed. There's some confusion, even on the financial aid side, that this form has to be completed. As you go through this process on your campus, it is something that you want to make sure is completed. As Shirley mentioned, this form was sent out about a year ago for completion, and only half have been returned. I again urge you to go back to your campus to see if this review process has taken place.

Each nonathletics achievement award should be completed and submitted to the committee in terms of the criteria that's established for the award. The process for requesting approval obviously begins with this form that you submit to the committee along with certain information, like the publications that you have on your campus that describe the awards. Those publications can come in many forms. It could be in your catalog. It could be an award information brochure that comes out from the admissions office, the

financial aid office or the registrar's office as far as catalogs are concerned. We need to see the material and publications that reference the award to make sure the language of the award is in compliance with the criteria for nonathletics achievement awards.

I'd now like to give a brief history on nonathletics achievement awards per Bylaw 15.4.6.4. Jeff's already mentioned the history behind the implementation of the nonathletics achievement award. We already discussed the committee process and that the committee has to be made up of predominantly faculty members. If you have admission and financial aid people on your campus who are also on the committee, we specifically want to know what their status is. In many cases, those staff members are considered academic members or have academic standards on your campuses. If that's the case, that doesn't present a problem.

Competition for the award must be among all members of the student body who meet certain publicized criteria. So again, your publications are essential in terms of how you describe who is going to qualify for the award. The award must be without regard to athletics ability for participation. It needs to be stressed that the institution cannot establish a quota for awards for student-athletes. These are some of the things that you need to be concerned about.

As for examples of this particular scholarship, I want you to particularly make note of the words in bold print: leadership activities and extracurricular school activities. "The scholarship is awarded on the basis of character, promise, growth and participation in leadership activities outside the classroom, such as church, community and extracurricular school activities." This type of phrasing in terms of the nonathletics achievement award usually causes problems in terms of trying to determine approval for this award because it leaves openings for athletics participation. It does not specifically say that athletics activities must be excluded.

It is recommended to make it clear for the committee review for the nonathletics achievement award to specifically state qualifications excluding athletics participation or ability. These are the types of things we're looking for as the committee reviews these nonathletics achievement awards. So phrases that reference participation in extracurricular activities, "demonstrate leadership abilities" and "leadership in activities outside the classroom" are pretty vague and leave a lot of interpretation that athletics can be inserted in terms of the possibility of awarding this particular type of award. This is actually an example from an institution that describes the nonathletics achievement award.

Let me see if we can just go over that in a little more detail: "The scholarship shall be awarded annually to the full-time student at the institution to recognize scholarship interests and creativity in preparation for a teaching career. The student must have completed at least two years of study at the institution in anticipation of becoming an elementary or secondary teacher. Final selection of the awardee shall be made by a committee comprised of the chair of the Department of Education, a representative of the office of the dean of the faculty and a faculty member who is not an athletics department staff member."

As we know, a lot of athletics staff members are also faculty members, so you really have to be careful as far as this is concerned. "Chosen jointly by the education department chair and the representative of the dean's office" is an example of a very clear description of how this award is processed and

how a student is selected. This is the type of information that we would like to see you implement on campuses to make it clear about how this type of award is given.

Here's another example. I will not read through this. This is pretty lengthy. But, again, it gives you an example of how the awardee is selected. It specifically states in No. 3 "excluding athletics participation." It also specifically defines the members of the committee. The committee also discussed this past summer the issue regarding academic qualifications for the nonathletics achievement award. We had an earlier discussion in 1996 and determined that this award should be based solely on academic qualifications.

In our meeting this past July, the committee noted that this information appeared to indicate that nonathletics achievement awards could be awarded to student-athletes who demonstrated special skills, including academic abilities, because there was some sense that some of our student-athletes were being penalized in some respects with their academic abilities and excluded from these awards. Therefore, the committee agreed to recommend to the Management Council that the definition of qualifications in Bylaw 15.4.6.4 could be based solely on academics, as defined by the designated faculty committee.

That walks you through the process and a description of what we're looking for in terms of the nonathletics achievement awards. We can pause to respond to questions. Are there questions regarding what I just covered?

Mr. Rasmussen: In both of the examples that you used, there's phrasing that references leadership qualities and so on. Those are included in criteria for an award that's given in excess of need. Yet, 15.4.7, regarding leadership and merit awards, specifically excludes the consideration of leadership in any award unless it stays completely within need. I was wondering if you'd comment on the distinction there. It seems to me there's an inconsistency that needs to be addressed either in one part of the bylaw or the other.

Ms. DeVeres: Jennifer wants to be real clear in response to that.

Jennifer L. Heppel (NCAA Staff): Bylaw 15.4.7, which talks about leadership and merit awards, doesn't specifically preclude the use of leadership and merit as criteria in awards. It specifically says that leadership and merit awards must be within need. However, for nonathletics achievement awards—this is a point of confusion—leadership and merit awards may be approved as nonathletics achievement awards provided they meet the criteria of the nonathletics achievement award per Bylaw 15.4.6.4.

If you don't meet that criteria, you cannot give those awards in excess of need, but you're not precluded from using leadership as a criteria in a nonathletics achievement award. It just can't be athletics leadership.

William T. Klika Jr. (Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison): Are we allowed to write letters of recommendation for various awards on our campus? If a student-athlete approaches you and asks for a letter of recommendation, are we allowed to write one?

Ms. DeVeres: That would not be something we'd want someone from the athletics department to do in terms of the selection of these type of awards.

Mr. Klika: Are we allowed to make a recommendation for a postgraduate award? When are you allowed to assist a student to receive either academic or outside awards?

Ms. Heppel: There was a specific bylaw that was passed exclusive of these more intricate bylaws regarding specific awards that stated that the athletics department staff cannot be involved in the recommendation process

to the financial aid office. So even if it doesn't say it in the specific language of an award, there is an overall principle that says athletics department staff members cannot make recommendations or evaluations of students to receive financial aid awards. If you're referencing the postgraduate scholarship, the only postgraduate scholarship I'm familiar with is the NCAA postgraduate scholarship, which is a different award.

Mr. Klika: What if a student is going to another graduate school or, for that matter, if the student's up for...

Ms. Heppel: But then they're not going to be a student-athlete at that school.

Mr. Klika: You can write a letter of recommendation for outside awards, not internal awards?

Ms. Heppel: Right. If somebody is not going to be a student-athlete, then we don't care what you do.

Mr. Klika: Fine.

Mr. Ankrom: This isn't going to help clean up your question, but I think the committee recognize that there are some inconsistencies and that this is the beginning of the process to get it all straightened out. We were ready to charge ahead and do a whole bunch of things. It quickly became obvious that we needed to start by having this discussion and pretty much start from near ground zero again to reconstruct a rational process. I think that makes sense.

George M. Harmon (Millsaps College): The question I have is on the leadership. In the first example, you're making the award on the basis of leadership, traits in high school and so forth, yet that is a part of a nonathletics achievement group of awards. The other part of that award is that it should be administered by an academic department like the art department or music. How do you do that in leadership? I'm not sure that that fits the need package. You could design a committee of faculty and the dean and so forth to do this?

Ms. DeVeres: Yes.

Mr. Harmon: But I'm not sure that's clear on those leadership awards as opposed to the award for music or art or something like that.

Ms. DeVeres: I was addressing the nonathletics achievement award specifically in terms of how this award can be given beyond consideration of need. Leadership awards as defined by bylaws still have to be given within the need of a student's award. Is your question who makes the award and determines the leadership qualifications? It still states pretty clearly that it has to be the academic side and someone who is not involved in athletics that has to make that determination. I guess that's still kind of fuzzy for you in terms of what's going on on your campus?

Mr. Harmon: Not on my campus.

Ms. DeVeres: Not on your campus. Of course, not on your campus. Okay. Clear as mud.

I think what Jeff said before is that it's clear as we review these awards, our other task is to go through the entire bylaws. Some of the information that's written needs to be reviewed because some of the information in our Division III section has been an overflow from some of the other divisions in terms of some of the financial aid legislation. We recognize that there has to be more scrutiny and total revamping of the information. So hopefully by the next time we're before you, this will be a lot clearer for most of you. This is an attempt to at least let us all begin the educational process that we all need to go through so we can see what some of the issues are.

Mr. Ankrom: My task is to talk about awards of circumstance. Some of

these principles have already been established, so I won't have to spend a lot of time going through it because some of the things that Georgette said actually apply here as well.

In terms of awards of circumstance, if you're looking at the Manual, they're described in Bylaw 15.4.6.3. You will be most interested in reviewing that bylaw if you want to try to get a handle on this. You also have a handout, but I'm covering the similar points as we go along.

What is in Bylaw 15.4.6.3? I've tried to highlight some of the words that I think are most important. First, the award must be available to all who meet publicized objective criteria. I think "all" is the key word here. There can be no relationship to athletics ability with these awards of circumstance. There can be no quota of these awards for student-athletes. You heard me talk about this earlier. You also heard Georgette talk about it a few moments ago. They must be listed in institutional publications and explained clearly. Everything must be out there in the light of day. You saw some examples earlier of recommended changes in the wording for the nonathletics achievement awards. I'm going to try to do the same thing with the awards of circumstance. These must be approved by the Management Council.

Those are the nuts and bolts features of Bylaw 15.4.6.3. I forgot one. The award is to be automatic to all those who actually qualify for the award. There can't be a process to determine who gets it.

With respect to the approval process, it's fairly straightforward. It's analogous to what you just heard Georgette talk about. The copy of the award from the appropriate institutional publication must be submitted to the NCAA Division III Financial Aid Committee. One of the tasks that you've heard us refer to already is the process of going through these and looking at them, reading them line by line and seeing what the catalogs have to say.

I might also add that we know at this point that a significant number of current Division III institutions have not yet bothered to go through the process of getting these awards approved, so we're all in this together. We're all acknowledging that there is this problem and that it's time to get a handle on that process.

Let me give you examples of awards of circumstance. Wittenberg University has what's called a Pastor Parent Grant. We're connected with the the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. If you were the child of a Lutheran pastor and you applied to Wittenberg, you qualify for this Pastor Parent Grant. All residents of the county where the college is located is another example. Some institutions try to encourage local kids to apply and will establish a "county" award. All residents from that county get the award. Sibling tuition reduction is another example of an award of circumstance, but not if it's for a left-handed Lutheran quarterback. That would not be a circumstance. Those are circumstances, but I don't think they fit the category here.

With respect to some helpful hints, try to avoid using in this description words like "selected" or "considered." If you have to select someone, it raises the possibility that someone will not be selected. That would not be consistent with our notion of an award of circumstance. Same thing with the word "considered." If these are not automatic, this does not mean that they are illegal. It might mean that they should be more appropriately considered under the category of a nonathletics achievement award, so they may be misclassified. The committee has seen some examples of this. Institutions have submitted awards under one category and they actually seem to fit better

in another category and would probably be okay if they were considered in the other category.

Don't require an interview. The interview is a legitimate part of the nonathletics achievement award. The arts department and the music department could ask a student to do a voice recital or something as a part of a music scholarship, but it's not possible for these awards of circumstance for those interviews to be conducted. Again, if the award requires an interview, it's not automatic.

Let me give an example of a "bad award," one that doesn't fit the bill here for an award of circumstance. Let's suppose that you find in a hypothetical university publication the following language and the institution intends to submit this award as an award of circumstance. I've constructed the hypothetical "Ankrom Scholarship." Maybe I'll have enough wealth to actually do such a thing some day. I'll make sure they get the appropriate wording. "Full-time students who apply for admission are automatically considered for the Ankrom Scholarship." "Automatically considered" is the problematic phrase. It seems inconsistent to say that someone will automatically be considered. It's inconsistent with the notion of an award of circumstance.

This raised the question: "What is a circumstance?" I know that previous versions of this committee and previous versions of the Management Council have wrestled with this question. Exactly what is a circumstance? Being left-handed is. But as we will see, it's probably not good enough. I think the contradiction that troubles the current committee has built up over time. That's not meant to be a criticism of anyone who has participated in previous development of legislation, nor of anyone on the current NCAA staff who has to wrestle with these contradictions on a day-by-day basis. Dick's earlier question raised a similar kind of issue. I think the issue is fairly straightforward. I'm going to try to work with another example to explain what I mean by the question I'm trying to raise.

Consider the following wording for this same Ankrom award. Suppose you saw in the hypothetical institutional publication the following wording for this award: "The scholarship is automatically awarded to students with a minimum 3.0 GPA." There are a couple of things potentially wrong with this wording. First of all, the word "scholarship" implies that it has something to do with scholarly work. There's also a connection here to a GPA threshold. "Automatically awarded," you can see the phrase seems to be littered with problems. The specific question I'm trying to raise here is whether or not academic achievement is a circumstance. Being the child of a Lutheran pastor, that's a circumstance. Having an older sibling in college, that's a circumstance. Being the resident of a particular county, that's a circumstance. You can't change a circumstance is what we're trying to dig away at here, but you certainly can change your GPA. We're raising the question: Is it a circumstance?

Awards of circumstance awarded and approved by the current committee contain these GPA threshold criteria, but we're not sure in our minds after reading back over everything that this all fits together very cleanly. That's why we're trying to raise this issue.

In 1978, the steering committee wrote the following: "Awards of circumstance are to be provided to those who are inherently qualified rather than qualified through some action he or she or any institution might make." I've edited that statement a little bit, but you will find in the steering committee documents from 1978 that wording. We think that the current applica-

tion of this award may have evolved from the original intent. The original intent was to leave out these GPA threshold components, but they have crept into and are a part of these awards now.

There's potential complication I'd like to speak about for a moment. The so-called matrix systems have the effect of making it pretty difficult to sort out exactly what type of aid is being given here. It makes the practice of giving aid based on circumstances indistinguishable from aid based on academic merit. You could look at two financial aid packages given to the same student by different institutions and you may detect what you think is an inconsistency, but it might be that one institution has "higher academic standards" and to get what would be called an academic merit award at one place requires a significantly greater GPA or SAT or something like that. This is pretty straightforward for an economist. We call this price discrimination. The use of the word "discrimination" in this context is fairly benign. It's simply saying that you charge different prices to different customers. We're all getting ready to fly home. One of the experiments that I thought would always be interesting to conduct is to go around the plane and ask people how much they paid to fly home. I think you would find quite a large number of different prices on the same plane going to the same location. This is price discrimination. Airlines and many industries do it. We sometimes get uncomfortable with thinking of higher education as an industry and colleges as firms and students as customers and so on. We all struggle with that language, but for our purposes on this committee, we sometimes have to slip into that way of thinking to understand the process that we're trying to uncover.

The question that's being raised is whether the institutional autonomy might conflict with a very well-intentioned NCAA policy. This is not a new issue, of course. I mean, there are all kinds of policies that make sense if you consider them in isolation, but do they conflict with institutional autonomy?

It raises the possibility that different types of finger pointing can easily begin. We can look at an aid package that a competitor institution gives to a student and it might bother us. We might say: "Well, they're doing something there. They got this student-athlete, and we really wanted the student-athlete. Got a better package there. Something's got to be wrong."

It's not necessarily the case that something is wrong, but that's what we have to try to struggle with.

Stanley P. Caine (Adrian College): Jeff, I've had the opportunity to review some of the awards of circumstance as part of the Management Council. I've seen a couple of times people have identified the circumstance as a lack of financial need. I have seen it at least twice. They get \$2,000 and the circumstance is that they have financial need. Would you like to comment on that?

Mr. Ankrom: I believe that it's true. I'm sure that it's true, Stan, but I think that if you try to go back to the original intent of what the steering committee was trying to say a couple of decades ago, I wouldn't personally interpret that circumstance that you're talking about there as a circumstance as it's being used here. We're moving toward a resolution to this problem. If the membership decides to define that as a circumstance, then so be it. The committee and all of us would have to live with that, but I personally don't think that is consistent with the original intent. The membership could decide that's the best I can do.

Leon Lunder (Carleton College): Some of the gray area that's been referred to in this discussion came through in the situation of circumstance.

However, I would agree that being born in a county as a criteria for a scholarship is a situation of circumstance, but living in that county would not. I could move into that county as I'm applying to an institution. So I think there's another gray area that we get into. It's something that doesn't really need an answer. It's one of those things like the initial thing you put up in your first presentation: "no financial aid should exceed need." Then, at the very bottom of the same proposal it said: "except when ..." I think that's where this whole financial aid discussion gets real uncomfortable, because these gray areas are really up to the interpretation of who happens to sit on those committees at that particular moment.

Mr. Ankrom: You're absolutely right. I'm aware of some graduate students who have used exactly that strategy to reduce their tuition by becoming residents of whatever state for a few months or six months or whatever it might take. So that's analogous to me. It seems analogous to what you're talking about, and you're absolutely right.

Karen Johnson (Alfred University): Good morning. I am relatively fortunate because mine's pretty simple. Academic honor awards, Bylaw 15.4.6.2. That's your green handout...

"They must be part of your institution's normal arrangements for academic scholarships. They have to be awarded independent of athletics interests and awarded in amounts consistent with the pattern of all such awards made by the institution. They may be offered only to students who graduate in the upper 20 percent of their high-school class or a student who earned a minimum high-school GPA of 3.5 or a student who achieved a minimum ACT sum score of 100 or a student who received a minimum recentered SAT score of 1,140 or a student who does not meet any one of the criteria under the above-mentioned items, but has completed at least one academic year in college and has earned a GPA of 3.3 for all academic work, resulting in degree credits during collegiate enrollment."

As most admissions offices do, it is permissible to combine scores from more than one ACT or SAT test in determining the award. As you can see, the renewal of academic honor awards applies to student-athletes who receive an academic honor award for the first time and do not meet the criteria in Bylaw 15.4.6.2-(a). This provision does not apply to the renewal of an academic honor award. Therefore, the renewal of an academic honor award may be based on criteria determined by the institution, but would not have to meet 15.4.6.2-(b) or be considered an award of circumstance or nonathletics achievement award in order for a student-athlete to receive the renewal.

Also important to note is that these awards do not have to be approved by this committee, but can be approved at the institutional level. For example, a scholarship at an institution that is awarded to students who are committed to cooperative and individual achievement. The minimum grade-point average required is a 3.25 and a minimum test score of 1,270 on the SAT or 29 on the ACT. Another example is scholarships available to in-state and out-of-state students. Freshmen must have an SAT of 1,100 and a 3.5 high-school GPA. Transfer students must have a minimum of 56 transferable credits or an associate's degree and a 3.5 grade-point average at an institution. The final example is scholarships that are available to incoming freshmen that will be enrolled on a full-time basis at your institution. Applicants must have an SAT score of 1,300 and a 3.8 high-school GPA. For renewal, the recipient must maintain a cumulative institutional GPA of 3.4 or above and complete at least 24 credits per academic year.

Are there any questions? Again, it's pretty straightforward. They do not have to be approved by this committee, but at the institutional level. I believe President Wharton is next.

Ms. Liddle: I want to thank the committee members for doing those presentations. It is apparent to all of the membership, as it is to this committee, that one very clear intention of this committee is to look at that legislation to see if we can clear it up. There do appear to be conflicts and confusion. That is apparent to all of us.

Now, we're going to change gears just a little bit and President Wharton is going to present educational strategies that we have discussed for the membership in order to help clear up some of the conflicts. President Wharton.

Donald P. Wharton (Plymouth State College): I think we all realize, and certainly it's an impression that has been reinforced by this morning's discussion, that our common education with respect to financial aid and awards issues really does have to be a continuing effort and an ongoing process. To that end, in addition to this morning's presentation, the committee has prepared a written guide to financial aid issues and awards at Division III. We are pleased that this project has already been approved by the Association and is currently in budget preparation. As all of you know, if you get a budget for something, it's going to happen.

It will be available to everyone this spring. If it doesn't become the bible for financial aid and awards issues in Division III, it's our hope that it will at least become the book of common prayer. We fully expect to produce regular updates and revisions of this guide. As we've seen already this morning, the complexity of the issue and the application of the regulations to individual situations require additional clarification and revision. We know full well that this guide will go through a number of editions. More than anything else, we want it to be useful and we want it to be used.

In addition to the guide, we have a couple of small but concrete suggestions that we think can be implemented quickly and easily at campuses to enhance the educational effort for all of us.

We recommend that campuses increase their presence and participation in NASFAA, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. It is a national organization. Some of our colleagues, like Georgetown, are members and officers in that organization. Doubtless, the vast majority of you have a financial aid director who is already a member of the organization. It would help your on-campus educational process if you would send an additional representative to at least their regional meetings. For an immediate effect, it might be useful for you to think about sending a team of folks who deal with these issues to one of those regional presentations. Some of the folks on this committee are members of NASFAA. They are going to encourage the organization to do special workshops at the regional meetings to help campus officials with financial aid issues.

Secondly, we suggest that you add your financial aid director to the list of five permissible callers to the NCAA. The Association necessarily limits the number of campus personnel who can call the Association for an interpretation of a rule or a financial aid issue. Our recommendation to you is that you ensure that your financial aid director is one of those five people from your campus who can make such a call.

Lastly, we're convinced that the continuing-education process on this issue really does have to be a matter of continuing dialogue and feedback, just as

we've had this morning. That's absolutely crucial to our common success. We plan to continue to create opportunities like this morning at future meetings and Conventions. We also will continue to send you surveys to get feedback directly from you in writing. We all urge you, please respond to those.

It's quite important that we know what your reaction is to this presentation or to a particular issue. We strongly encourage you to give us feedback. Contact us individually or contact us indirectly through people you know on the Management Council or the Presidents Council. However you choose to get that feedback to us, that's very, very important. We really urge you to do that. I know I speak for all of my colleagues on this committee when I tell you that we find this work a stimulating challenge. We know it's work that's important to the future of the division. We also know that we can't do that work well unless we have your collegial counsel, support and feedback. We know if we do have that, the work will go just fine.

Ms. Liddle: Our last presenter is Walter Johnson. Walter is our liaison to the Management Council. Walter is going to talk about our future plans.

Mr. Johnson: When I came up here yesterday, I talked about how narrow the stage was. I'm not sure who heard me, but there is yellow caution tape back here now and there's a barrier set up so they make sure you don't fall off. I'm not sure if we're that efficient or the hotel is that efficient. Either way, though, I think progress can happen fast when you speak to the right people. I think we are speaking to the right people.

I want to talk about future plans. In order for the area of financial aid to continue to be one of the visible and tangible ways that Division III can identify itself, I think we need to consider ways to have more communication. We need to consider ways to have more education, to have more institutional input and to have less cumbersome and ambiguous legislation in this area. That's what we're going to be trying to work toward with your assistance.

In order to accomplish this, we need to look at the following: What should the time line be? How and when do we clean up the legislation in Bylaws 15 and 3? Who on your campuses should be involved in the educational process?

Relative to the time line, we have a couple of options. Option A: We can move as a committee toward legislation for 1999, taking from this Convention the feedback we receive from you, start work and be prepared to present those legislative suggestions to the Management Council for approval and to be set forward for 1999. Option B: We can wait.

We can have more communication with the membership via meetings with conferences, via meetings with financial aid officers at those institutions, communication with the national financial aid association and then move forward with the information that we gather at those meetings and recommend legislation in 2000.

We have an opportunity in this particular case to be thorough. It's an issue that we have all talked about at one time or another. If we really want to get to a point where we have some general consensus, it might be wise to wait and get additional feedback.

The second order of business is cleaning up the legislation in Bylaw 15. We can try to make everything in that bylaw apply to Division III and clean up some of the ambiguities that exist there. One example is outside scholarships organizations being able to use athletics participation as one of the granting criteria. Is that something we want to get involved in? Is that an issue we want to try to address?

We'll look at cleaning up interpretations on issues that are covered in the

bylaw and then making the wording a little more user-friendly so that what I read is the same thing you read or at least we can draw the same conclusions from what exists there. Eliminating some of the legalese can take place right away, but maybe it would be wise to wait until we have more information on hand before we move forward.

In July of 1996, under the old structure, the Division III Steering Committee sent a mailing regarding the application of Bylaw 15.4.6—nonathletics achievement awards. The Management Council has recommended that that mailing be resent. Is this something the membership wants us to do? I don't know if you recall getting that. I'm not sure if they put a copy on your desk, but it related to that bylaw. Should this come to the athletics departments? Should it go to the financial aid directors and presidents or should it encompass all three?

We want to make sure that we get the information to the people who are going to be able to use it the most. This information is good for us to know, but sometimes I wonder whether or not at many of our institutions we haven't involved our financial aid officers enough with the information that is pertinent to us as an Association so that what they're doing is clearly in line with what our regulations suggest they should be doing.

Another option is to remail a survey that was sent in November of 1997 that set up the priorities that we decided to discuss today. The purpose would be to find out where the membership stands on the issues now. After being at this Convention, hearing what's going on, hearing from the financial aid committee, the things that you placed as the priorities on that survey, are they still the priorities for you now? Can we have some idea of what order of importance we should place on the work that we do? We could get more suggestions and ideas from you about the financial aid issue, and then create a base of communication between the financial aid officers and member institutions. We could use that base with the national financial aid office so that the regulations that they work with, again, work well with the regulations of this Association.

Ultimately, we want to find common ground. We want to find a place where all of us can be comfortable as associates and know that we're all really trying to work and play on the same playing field. I think we initially went into this with the idea that—especially after you listen to some colleagues about situations that occur at different institutions—there's some folks out there cheating. We backed way off of that and we realized that there was a lack of understanding of how to apply the regulations that were on the books.

We really want to pay close attention to making sure there's an understanding of those regulations so that we all are on the same page and we don't walk away feeling like someone else has an unfair advantage. If the committee works in that direction, with your input, we can get to a place where we can all agree. Thank you.

Ms. Liddle: Thank you, Walter.

Beverly Klooster (Calvin College): I'm a member of the Division III Interpretations and Legislation Committee.

As a reminder, at the moment, our committee is working very hard to get the document that we will all use into a handbook for Division III. We're trying to take all the Divisions I and II references out of it. That is an ongoing project. We're meeting this afternoon to look at our first review. We're trying to get on the same page there as well with this committee.

Ms. Heppel: Thank you, Bev. Carolayne Henry, who is a staff liaison to

that committee, and I have had significant communication about that process and don't expect to be duplicating any efforts there. Thank you for pointing that out because it is important. I think it needs to be done.

So much of what is in Bylaw 15 has to do with regulations that have nothing to do with Division III. It makes it very difficult to understand the bylaw and sort through and pull out the one or two sentences in three pages that you might have to deal with. We are trying to clean that up. Carolayne and I have communicated and we expect the two committees—the Financial Aid Committee and the Legislation and Interpretations Committee—to work very closely on Bylaw 15.

Ms. Liddle: The committee has set aside time for comments, questions or open discussion. I'd like to encourage the membership to come forth and contribute to this discussion.

Judith M. Sweet (University of California, San Diego): On behalf of the membership, I would like to thank the committee for your outstanding presentations.

I don't know if this is good or bad, but Jeff, you did a wonderful history. Some of us have lived through that history. We've been there for the 20 years that this has been discussed. I think this is the most user-friendly presentation that we've heard. I encourage you to continue your good work.

A couple of suggestions. It may be useful to ask the membership to submit specific questions to you and for you to make the responses to those questions available to the entire membership, not just the individual who is asking the question. That can be done through written communication or is there a possibility of setting up a Web page where the membership could reference specific circumstances that you have dealt with?

Thank you for your outstanding work this morning. (Applause)

Ms. Liddle: Thank you, Judy.

Gloria R. Scott (Bennett College): I have several comments. I would suggest to both the Financial Aid and Awards Committee and the Legislation and Interpretations Committee that we deal with the word "leadership." What is it we're really talking about? It has become a rubric.

Are we talking about athletics captains of teams showing leadership? Are we talking about the recognized quality that people can get other people to follow? I think that's going to be a word that needs to be focused on as we're talking about it as a criterion.

I also wanted to speak to having the committee consider some of the things that are arising now and will arise in the future with relationship to student-athletes and work or support. One is the Americorps projects in which students are able to work. Increasingly, student-athletes who can participate with young children and high-school children are being asked to be a part of that. Of course, the Americorps fund support comes only after the student has graduated and can use that money for graduate study on the other side, but that needs to be considered.

Also, community service learning is being paid for by some projects. Student-athletes with the summer-work programs or academic-year-work programs are helping young athletes with leadership, athletics programs and sports development programs.

I think that some early attention to those might be important. But most of all, "leadership" really does need some attention as it positions itself. Thank you.

Marjorie B. Giles (Central College, Iowa): May I assume that when the

financial aid guidelines are ready, they will be sent automatically to each institution?

Ms. Liddle: That's correct.

Ms. Giles: Thank you.

Ms. Heppel: Currently, you get a Guide to Financial Aid that addresses all three divisions. We're simply removing Division III from that guide and creating a separate guide. Instead of getting the divisional guide, you will just get a Division III guide.

Ms. Giles: I have a second question about the use of matrix systems. About a year ago, I requested an interpretation on the use of the matrix system as it affects student-athletes and was told that even in using a matrix system, you could not "over-award" a student in that cell. They could not exceed need. I thought I heard Jeff imply the opposite of that today and would like some clarification.

Ms. Heppel: The immediate response is that a student-athlete of Division III cannot get aid that exceeds their need. There are exceptions to that. Institutions that use matrix systems have submitted the criteria for those systems under an award of circumstance, so that anybody who meets a minimum GPA and a minimum test score will get a certain amount of aid because it is automatically given to all students who meet that criteria. That's the question that we raised in the awards of circumstance. That was approved by the Management Council as an acceptable award of circumstance.

So what you've seen happening is that these institutions are submitting those matrix systems as awards of circumstance and they're approved even though they're based purely on academic credentials, regardless of how minimal those credentials might be.

Ms. Giles: What if there are criteria other than academic credentials in that matrix?

Ms. Heppel: Then it's going to be looked at by whatever those criteria are. The question raised earlier was: Is no need a circumstance? The answer to that is "no." That has been addressed. There is an official interpretation out there that says no need is not a circumstance. So other criteria that may be in this matrix system would depend on how concrete those criteria are. Again, if it includes something like an interview or other things that you can't pin down to make automatic to all students, then it wouldn't be an award of circumstance.

Ms. Gremmels: I have a couple of specific questions that I hope will be of interest to other people.

Our awards were approved by the steering committee just shortly before your committee came into existence. Do we need to have those reapproved?

Ms. Liddle: No.

Ms. Gremmels: Thank you. How will the record-keeping be handled? Is there a central file for all of these approvals?

Ms. Heppel: I have files at the office of all awards that have been submitted since the legislation came into place in the late 1980s. As of this time, those files consist of awards from 30 percent of the Division III institutions, so 70 percent of the institutions have not submitted any awards.

It may be that a significant number of those institutions do not offer any awards that need to be approved. I don't think it's automatic that 70 percent are ignoring the rules, but we have never asked the question of an institution if it sponsors any of these awards. That may be something that the committee needs to ask of the membership. Are you not submitting these awards

not because you didn't know or you don't understand, but just because you don't have any?

Ms. Gremmels: This will sound like a complaint, but it's not. I'm actually well past that stage now. When we were trying to determine what awards had been approved, we got at least five different answers depending on what days we called and who we talked to. That's why I wanted to know if it is incumbent upon us to keep detailed records? I'm sure it's a good idea, in any case, but are things a little less chaotic?

Ms. Heppel: It probably hasn't been as organized as it could be. If anybody in here has specific questions, you're more than welcome to call and ask for me. We are in the process of compiling a list for each institution.

Right now we have a full file that has all the award information. I would have to go through and look at the letters. We currently are in the process of doing that at the national office and hope to have a database available for institutions so it becomes very simple to say this award was approved on this date.

Ms. Gremmels: Thank you very much.

Ms. Zotos: When I think of financial aid, I really think of it in two ways. The first way is everything you discussed here today—what awards we are allowed to give, what's permitted, what's not, how different schools use their resources differently, the criteria they use. I thought your presentation was excellent and helped to understand that completely. I think it helped us also understand that when we see an athlete get a package that maybe is \$8,000 more from another school than our school, it isn't necessarily cheating. It's what resources they have and how they appropriate those resources. To ever hope for an absolute level playing field in financial aid is impossible because every school has its own particular system.

However, I do see a second piece to it where I think a level playing field can be looked at, and that is how within your own institution those resources are being provided. I think there's another piece that we need to look at. Are your athletes being privileged when compared to the rest of your own student body? For the last several years at Drew, we have monitored that. We have taken the athlete population out after the freshman class came in and looked at their mean and median financial aid packages and compared it to the rest of the student body. It was reaffirmed to us that we're not privileging them because we're within \$100. Then we did it team by team to see if any particular team may be being privileged in some way. Again, when there were any discrepancies, we looked at the academic profile of those "maybe" teams and found that four out of five freshmen had 1,400 or above on their SAT, which qualified them for very high merit awards. Maybe that's why there was a gap from that mean or median figure. It's been very telling for us.

The Middle Atlantic Conference has now adopted that policy and they're starting to ask every school to submit mean and median athlete population financial aid packages compared to their student body. I think it's terrific. Because of that, I think we can establish a level playing field. No one expects every school to be the same, but we do expect that each school is appropriating their resources the correct way. I'd encourage every institution to start doing that because it is telling. It will help you see if there are any discrepancies.

I want to know if the committee had discussed the possibility of somewhere down the road the NCAA having an instrument to send out to institutions to monitor that kind of thing?

Ms. Liddle: Thanks very much, Connee. Yes, we have discussed both of those topics. Other comments?

To close, I'd like to thank three constituencies. First of all, I would like to thank you, the membership, for being very attentive on this last morning. I know what it's like to sit out there. Secondly, I'd like to thank my committee members. They have been easy to work with as a team. Thirdly, I'd like to thank the NCAA for its support, which is invaluable. Could we have a round of applause for everyone? That would be great. (Applause)

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. McCray: Shirley, thank you and the panel very much. That was a terrific presentation.

We've done well this morning. Our next item of business involves the election of our new Management Council members. You'll recall that under our new governance structure, the Nominating Committee initially selects Management Council nominations. The Management Council and the Presidents Council then review those nominations. The positions then are ultimately filled by a vote of our membership during our annual business session. We have, I believe, five appointments to make. To present the official slate of Management Council nominees, I am happy to introduce Art Eason. Art.

Arthur Eason (William Paterson College): On behalf of the Nominating Committee, I move the formal election of the five new candidates for the Division III Management Council. This slate of candidates was approved at the Management Council's and the Presidents Council's October meetings and is now presented to the Division III membership for election.

The candidates are: Dee Fairchild, director of athletics, Grinnell College, Midwest Conference; Donna M. Ledwin, director of athletics, College of Notre Dame, an independent institution; Eugene Marshall Jr., director of athletics, Staten Island College, City of New York University Athletic Conference; Oscar C. Page, chief executive officer, Austin College, independent institution; Joy L. Reign, director of athletics, Rowan University, New Jersey Athletic Conference.

Mr. McCray: We have nominations. Is there a second?

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. McCray: Are there other nominees from the floor? I hear and see none. There being no nominees from the floor, all those in favor of the slate please indicate so by saying "aye." Those opposed, same sign. So ordered. Congratulations to Dee Fairchild, Donna Ledwin, Eugene Marshall, Oscar Page and Joy Reign. We look forward to working with you. (Applause)

At this time I would like to ask John Biddiscombe to come forward, please.

CLOSING REMARKS

John S. Biddiscombe (Wesleyan University, Connecticut): Thank you very much. I rise on behalf of the Division III membership in recognition of Bridget Belgiovine. As we all know, Bridget has served us extraordinarily well this past year as chair of the Management Council. However, many of you may not recall that prior to restructuring, Bridget served as an officer of the NCAA in her role as Division III vice-president.

In this capacity, she worked tirelessly, sacrificing much of her personal life to attend the many meetings associated with the restructuring. Bridget, your leadership has been very strong. You have been an effective facilitator. Your presence at the Division III helm has given us confidence in the

Division III leadership. We appreciate your efforts and commitment. We salute you. (Applause)

Bridget Belgiovine (University of Wisconsin, La Crosse): Thank you very much. It has been my distinct honor and pleasure to work with so many members of Division III. These last four years have been incredibly rewarding both personally and professionally.

I believe that the division is in wonderful hands. John and the rest of the Management Council members I assure you will do all that they can to continue the direction and the mission and vision of this division. Thank you very much. (Applause)

Mr. McCray: Thank you, Bridget. We're now open for discussion, or questions, gratuitous or otherwise. Come forward, if you please, and we'll recognize you. There being none, I'm reminded that you should leave your paddles at your places. Seeing none at the microphones, I would accept a motion to adjourn.

Unidentified Delegate: Moved.

[The motion was seconded.]

Mr. McCray: All in favor signify so by saying "aye." Best of luck. Travel well. Goodbye.

[The Division III business session was adjourned at 10 a.m.]

Appendix A

92nd Annual Convention

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERSHIP

[Note: Pursuant to Constitution 5.3.13, all amendments shall become effective not earlier than the first day of August following adoption by the Convention; however, if a voting delegate wishes to propose an immediate effective date, or to propose any other effective date prior to the first day of August, a two-thirds majority of all delegates present and eligible to vote on the amendment is required to approve the immediate or alternative effective date. Those proposals that were submitted with an immediate effective date are noted with an asterisk (*) by the effective date. Those proposals that receive the required vote to carry an immediate effective date and that are adopted, become effective upon adjournment of the Convention.]

[Note: In the following proposals, those letters and words that appear in *italics* are to be deleted and those letters and words that appear in **bold face** are to be added. All page numbers listed refer to the corresponding pages in the 1997-98 NCAA Manuals.] All votes were by show of paddles unless otherwise indicated. *Only those proposed amendments upon which the 92nd annual Convention took some action appear in this appendix. Amendments-to-amendments immediately follow the proposal to which they relate.*

TOPICAL GROUPINGS OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS 92nd ANNUAL CONVENTION

<i>Proposal Numbers</i>	<i>General Topic</i>
1 through 19	Division II Legislative Proposals
1 through 7	Presidents Council Grouping
8	Amateurism
9 through 12	Eligibility
13 through 15	Playing and Practice Seasons
16 through 19	General
20 through 26	Division III Legislative Proposals

DIVISION II LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

The NCAA Division II Presidents Council has determined that it will deal primarily with those national issues in Division II athletics

Legislative Proposals

A-1

that prompt wide-spread concern among Division II chief executive officers.

Under the new governance structure implemented last August, legislative proposals developed by the Division II Management Council or by Division II committees reporting to it must be submitted to the Presidents Council for review. They cannot be placed on the agenda for consideration at the NCAA Convention unless the Presidents Council agrees to sponsor them. This procedure was established to affirm presidential control of intercollegiate athletics in Division II.

The Division II Presidents Council has identified those proposals that it believes are of particular interest to Division II chief executive officers and has included them in the Presidents Council grouping. It should be noted, however, that inclusion of proposals in the Presidents Council grouping does not necessarily constitute a position by the Division II Presidents Council for or against a proposal. The only proposals officially sponsored by the Presidents Council are those identified with an asterisk before the proposal number. All proposals in the Presidents Council grouping are subject to a roll-call vote.

PRESIDENTS COUNCIL GROUPING

*NO. 1 (NO. 2-1) CONFERENCE STUDENT-ATHLETE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Intent: To require each Division II conference to establish a conference student-athlete advisory committee as a condition and obligation of Division II membership.

Constitution: Amend 3.3.4 by adding new 3.3.4.5, page 14, as follows:
[Division II, roll call]

"3.3.4.5 Conference Student-Athlete Advisory Committee. Each Division II conference shall establish a student-athlete advisory committee for its member institutions' student-athletes. The composition and duties of the committee shall be determined by the conference."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: The establishment of institutional student-athlete advisory committees has allowed student-athletes to become more involved in the administration of intercollegiate athletics. This proposal will allow student-athletes to become more involved at the regional and national level. It also will permit conferences to address concerns specific to its members by providing them with the authority to establish the responsibilities and compositional requirement of their committees.

Action: Adopted, 215-1-1.

*NO. 2 (NO. 2-2) GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Intent: To specify that the provisions of Bylaw 10.3 are applicable to staff members of member conferences.

Bylaws: Amend 10.3, page 51, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"10.3 GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

"Staff members of a member conference, staff members of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly:"

[Remainder of 10.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the former NCAA Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: This proposal will help to address continued concerns of the Association related to gambling activities by expanding the scope of the legislation to apply to conference staff members as well as institutional staff members and student-athletes.

Action: Adopted, 207-1-2.

*NO. 3 (NO. 2-9) FINANCIAL AID — PELL GRANTS — DIVISION II

Intent: In Division II, to specify that a Pell Grant shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid for a student-athlete.

Bylaws: Amend 15.2.4.1, page 152, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.2.4.1 Pell Grants. In Division I, a Pell Grant shall not be included when determining the permissible amount of a full grant-in-aid for a student-athlete. In Division II, a student-athlete may receive a Pell Grant in combination with institutional financial aid, provided the overall grant total does not exceed the student-athlete's cost of attendance per 15.01.7."

Source: All members of the Lone Star Conference and Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: Pell Grants are awarded by the Federal government without institutional input to determine the recipients. Students who are not athletes are eligible to receive a Pell Grant in combination with all other merit-based aid in excess of their cost of attendance, inasmuch as the Pell Grant is an entitlement grant. Student-athletes should be treated in the same manner. This proposal will put institutions on a level playing field by permitting a student-athlete to receive all Pell Grant moneys to which he or she is entitled without any regard to NCAA cost-of-atten-

dance restrictions. It should be noted that Division I adopted an identical regulation at the 1996 NCAA Convention.

Committee Position (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted, 124-83-1.

***NO. 4 (NO. 2-10) DIVISION II MAXIMUM EQUIVALENCY LIMITS — INSTITUTIONS THAT SPONSOR CROSS COUNTRY BUT DO NOT SPONSOR TRACK**

Intent: To limit the value of financial aid awards that an institution that sponsors cross country but not indoor or outdoor track may provide student-athletes in the sport of cross country as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2 by adding new 15.5.3.2.4, pages 160-161, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.5.3.2.4 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits — Institutions That Sponsor Cross Country but Do Not Sponsor Track. There shall be a limit of five on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the sport of men's cross country, if the institution does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track for men. There shall be a limit of six on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the sport of women's cross country, if the institution does not sponsor indoor or outdoor track for women."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council).

Effective Date: August 1, 2000.

Rationale: Current legislation allows institutions that sponsor cross country and indoor or outdoor track to provide the equivalent of 12.6 scholarships. Institutions that sponsor only cross country are also allowed to provide 12.6 scholarships. As a result, a competitive imbalance exists in favor of cross country programs at institutions that do not also sponsor indoor or outdoor track. This proposal will help create a level playing field while furthering the principle of gender equity.

Action: Adopted, 166-42-5.

***NO. 5 (NO. 2-11) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION II MAXIMUM EQUIVALENCY LIMITS**

Intent: To limit the value of financial aid awards that an institution that sponsors cross country but not indoor or outdoor track

may provide student-athletes in the sport of cross country as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2 by adding new 15.5.3.2.4, pages 160-161, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"15.5.3.2.4 Division II Maximum Equivalency Limits — Institutions That Sponsor Cross Country But Do Not Sponsor Track. There shall be a limit of five on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the sport of men's cross country, if the institution does not also sponsor indoor or outdoor track for men. There shall be a limit of five on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in the sport of women's cross country, if the institution does not also sponsor indoor or outdoor track for women."

Source: All members of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic and Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: Currently, a Division II institution that only sponsors cross country is permitted to award the same value (equivalency) of financial aid awards as an institution that also offers indoor and/or outdoor track. This proposal would establish a limit of five financial aid awards in the sport of cross country if an institution does not also sponsor track, thus creating financial parity among the institutions in Division II that sponsor only cross country.

Committee Position (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal, but noted its preference for Proposal No. 4 (No. 2-10)

Action: Withdrawn.

***NO. 6 (NO. 2-12) FINANCIAL AID — DIVISION II MAXIMUM EQUIVALENCY LIMITS — FOOTBALL**

Intent: To decrease the limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in Division II football from 36 to 30.

Bylaws: Amend 15.5.3.2.1, page 160, as follows:

[Division II football, roll call]

"15.5.3.2.1 Division II Men's Sports. There shall be a limit on the value (equivalency) of financial aid awards (per 15.02.4.1) that an institution may provide in any academic year to counters in each Division II men's sport, as follows:

"Football 36.0 30.0"

Source: Abilene Christian University; Bemidji State University; Fairmont State College; Ferris State University; Fort Lewis College; Michigan Technological University; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Morris; Moorhead State University; Quincy University; St. Joseph's College (Indiana); Wayne State University (Michigan); West Virginia Wesleyan College; Western State College of Colorado; and Winona State University.

Effective Date: August 1, 2001.

Rationale: With 60 percent of all Division II football playing institutions already providing less than the value of 30 equivalencies, this proposal will not dilute the quality of football or the quality of student-athletes that can be recruited at the Division II level. The survey results from the financial aid project team showed that the average Division II football equivalency per institution is 24.1. The "phase in" period of three years will allow institutions providing in excess of 30 equivalencies to reduce financial aid awards at their own pace and will permit all current student-athletes to finish their playing careers at the same scholarship level. Division II institutions that sponsor football have difficulty being in compliance with Title IX because of the cost to operate a successful football program. This proposal will allow the monies saved to be transferred to the women's program to assist an institution in achieving gender equity.

Committee Position (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Defeated, 61-75-6.

***NO. 7 (NO. 2-15) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS
— SPRING PRACTICE — DIVISION II
FOOTBALL**

Intent: In Division II football, to specify that 12 of the spring practice sessions may involve contact, provided contact does not occur prior to the third practice session; to specify that full contact 11-on-11 sessions are limited to three of the 12 practice sessions; further, to reduce the number of spring football contact sessions that may involve tackling to eight.

Bylaws: Amend 17.10.6, pages 217-218, as follows:

[Division II, roll call]

"17.10.6 Out-of-Season Athletically Related Activities. Student-athletes and members of the coaching staff shall not engage in countable athletically related activities outside the playing season, except for the following:

[17.10.6-(a) unchanged.]

"(c) Spring Practice — Division II. In Division II, 15 postseason practice sessions [including intrasquad scrimmages and the spring game permitted in 17.10.5.2-(a)] are permissible, pro-

vided they are conducted within a period of 29 consecutive calendar days, omitting vacation and examination days officially announced on the institution's calendar and days during which the institution is closed due to inclement weather, with no practices permitted on Sundays. Any such practice sessions held during vacation days may not be of longer duration than those normally held when academic classes are in session. Only 10 of the 15 sessions may involve contact and such contact shall not occur prior to the third practice session. The noncontact practice sessions may involve headgear as the only piece of protective equipment. Of the 12 permissible contact sessions, eight sessions may involve tackling and no more than three of the eight tackling sessions may be devoted primarily (greater than 50 percent of practice time) to 11-on-11 scrimmages. Tackling shall be prohibited in four of the 12 contact sessions. An institution has the discretion to determine the practice activities (other than tackling) that may occur during the four noncontact non-tackling sessions (e.g., use of blocking dummies), provided no football gear or as well as the protective equipment other than head gear, shoulder pads, shoes, pants and porous lightweight jerseys are to be worn by the involved student-athletes. If an institution conducts a "spring game" per 17.10.5.2-(a), the game shall be counted as one of the three sessions that can be devoted primarily to 11-on-11 scrimmages. A student-athlete's participation in countable athletically related activities (see 17.02.1.1) during the spring practice period shall be limited to a maximum of four hours per day and 20 hours per week;"

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Currently, the NCAA's national injury surveillance system (ISS) shows a two to three times higher risk of total and serious injury (e.g., concussion, fractures, surgeries and knee injuries) in spring football practice when compared to fall. This proposal should assist in reducing serious injury in spring football by (a) reducing the number of days where tackling is permitted from 10 to eight (these practices are where 90 percent of the serious injuries occur); (b) reducing the number of practices where over 50 percent of the practice time is devoted to 11-on-11 scrimmaging from a potential of 10 to three (almost half of the injuries reported in spring practice occur in this type of scrimmage activity); and (c) requiring the first two days of practice to involve no contact (helmet only) to allow acclimatization to the activity (current legislation would allow a full-pad scrimmage on the first day of spring practice). This proposal is based on reliable injury data provided by athletics trainers and focuses on contact type rather than quantity. Its potential effectiveness has been endorsed by the

American Football Coaches Association and the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports.

Action: Adopted, 117-8-4.

AMATEURISM

NO. 8 (NO. 2-3) EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES — NATIONAL GOVERNING BODIES

Intent: To permit U.S. national governing bodies to award educational expenses to individuals (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athletes) as specified.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 12.1.1.1.3.1 by adding new 12.1.1.1.3.1.1, page 60, as follows:

[Division II]

"12.1.1.1.3.1.1 Educational Expenses — U.S. National Governing Body. An individual (prospective student-athlete or student-athlete) may receive educational expenses awarded by a U.S. national governing body (NGB) pursuant to the applicable conditions set forth in 15.2.5.5."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 15.2.5.5, page 154, as follows:

[Division II]

"15.2.5.5 Educational Expenses — U.S. Olympic Committee or U.S. National Governing Body. A student-athlete may receive educational expenses awarded by the U.S. Olympic Committee or a U.S. national governing body (NGB). The amount of the financial assistance shall be subject to the following limitations:

[15.2.5.5-(a) unchanged.]

"(b) The recipient's choice of institutions shall not be restricted by the U.S. Olympic Committee or U.S. national governing body;"

[Remainder of 15.2.5.5 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: This proposal addresses two important objectives. First, the proposal promotes cost effectiveness, inasmuch as institutions would be assisted in covering scholarship costs, thereby freeing up the funds for other purposes. Second, the proposal would provide assistance for declining Olympic sports. If this proposal is adopted, national governing bodies would likely establish grant programs as a key part of their efforts to stem the decline in the number of student-athletes and sports programs at the collegiate level. The former Recruiting Committee and Olympic Sports Liaison Committee have examined the concept and the members of those committees

do not believe that the adoption of this proposal would provide institutions with an opportunity to gain a significant recruiting advantage. Further, the proposal will not result in a competitive advantage for institutions, inasmuch as the financial aid must be included in the team limits in the applicable sport.

Action: Adopted.

ELIGIBILITY

NO. 9 (NO. 2-4) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS — PROSPECTIVE AND ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render a prospective or enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

- A. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.1.9 by adding new 13.1.9.12, page 84, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.1.9.12 Effect of Violation. Violations of 13.1.9 shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

- B. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.5.1, page 86, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.5.1 Recruiting Advertisements. The publication of advertising or promotional material, by or on behalf of a member institution, designed to solicit the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete is not permitted. Accordingly, a member institution may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials published to provide information concerning the athletics participation or evaluation of prospects (e.g., recruiting publications) for any purpose whatsoever, including advertisements, a listing of prospective or enrolled student-athletes who will attend the institution and informative materials related to the institution. Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

- C. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.5.2, page 86, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.5.2 Media Guides, Recruiting Brochures. A member institution may not develop a separate media guide or recruiting brochure to send to the media or alumni that does not meet the specification outlined in 13.4.1-(i). Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility."

- D. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.5.3, page 87, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.4.5.3 Miscellaneous Promotions. Member institutions and their representatives of athletics interests are prohibited from financing, arranging or utilizing recruiting aids (e.g., newspaper advertisements, bumper stickers, message buttons) designed to publicize the institution's interest in a particular prospect. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

E. **Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1.2, page 176, as follows:

[Division II]

"16.8.1.2 Competition While Representing Institution. An institution may provide actual and necessary travel expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging and meals) to a student-athlete for participation in athletics competition, provided the student-athlete is representing the institution (competes in the uniform of the institution) and is eligible for collegiate competition. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility.** Such competition includes:"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the former NCAA Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is similar to proposals adopted at the 1996 and 1997 NCAA Conventions, and is an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a prospective or enrolled student-athlete ineligible (as a result of the prospect's or student-athlete's involvement in a violation of NCAA rules) in instances in which the prospect or student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurs. Currently, violations of the five paragraphs in this proposal always result in immediate restoration of eligibility without conditions imposed. It is important to note, however, that although violations of these provisions would have no individual eligibility ramifications, the institution still would need to self-report the violation to the enforcement staff at the NCAA national office, and the NCAA Committee on Infractions would remain responsible for assessing institutional responsibility.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 10 (NO. 2-5) ELIGIBILITY — RESTITUTION FOR RECEIPT OF IMPROPER BENEFIT

Intent: To specify circumstances in which an institution does not have to declare ineligible and seek restoration on behalf of an

A-10 ————— *Legislative Proposals*

individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) who received an improper benefit while a prospect, provided the individual repays the value of the improper benefit.

A. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.2.1, page 84, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.2.1 General Regulation. An institution's staff member or any representative of its athletics interests shall not be involved, directly, or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospect or the prospect's relatives or friends other than expressly permitted by NCAA regulation. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or friends. **For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.**"

B. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.2.2 by adding new 13.2.2.1, page 84, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.2.2.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. **For violations of 13.2.2 in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e. prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.**"

C. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.6.1, page 87, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.6.1 General Restrictions. An institution may not provide transportation to a prospect other than on the official paid visit or, on an unofficial visit, to view a practice or competition site and other institutional facilities (located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus) when accompanied by an institutional staff member. However, an institution may not provide transportation to attend one of the institution's home contests (on or

Legislative Proposals ————— A-11

off campus) during the unofficial visit. For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the prospect repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- D. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.2 by adding new 13.6.2.9, page 88, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.6.2.9 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.6.2 in which the value of the transportation is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1 and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- E. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.1, page 90, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.1 (Entertainment/Tickets on Official Visit) General Restrictions. An institution may provide entertainment, which may not be excessive, on the official visit only for a prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse and only within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus. Entertainment and contact by the representatives of the institution's athletics interests during the official visit are prohibited in Division I and confined to campus in Division II. It is not permissible to entertain other relatives or friends (including dates) of a prospect at any time at any site. For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the entertainment is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- F. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.2, page 90, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.2 (Entertainment/Tickets on Official Visit) Complimentary Admissions. During the official visit, complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event may be provided only to a prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse. Such admissions may provide seating only in the general seating area of the facility utilized for conducting the event. Providing seating during the conduct of the event (including intermission) for the prospect or the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse in the facility's press box, special seating box(es) or bench area is specifically prohibited. For violations of this bylaw in which the individual receives an excessive number of complimentary admissions, and the value of the excessive admissions if \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- G. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5 by adding new 13.7.5.5.1, page 91, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.5.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.7.5.5 in which the value of the benefit to the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- H. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.7 by adding new 13.7.5.7.2, page 91, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.7.5.7.2 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.7.5.7.1 in which the value of the excessive meals is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

ity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

- I. **Bylaws:** Amend 13.8.2 by adding new 13.8.2.7, page 93, as follows:
[Division II]

"13.8.2.7 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefit. For violations of 13.8.2 in which the value of the entertainment/tickets/meal is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the former NCAA Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal represents a new concept created by the former Eligibility Committee and is designed to eliminate the ineligibility component for those violations of NCAA rules in which the action by the committee is to require repayment or restitution in order for the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) to regain his or her eligibility. These proposals will not require the involved institution to declare the individual (prospect or student-athlete) ineligible and seek restoration of eligibility; rather, these proposals require the individual to repay the value of the benefit in order to regain eligible status. The individual remains ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the benefit until such time repayment has been documented by the institution. Violations of these provisions remain violations that have institutional responsibility and documentation of repayment shall be submitted to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 11 (NO. 2-7) ELIGIBILITY — JOINT COLLEGE/HIGH-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Intent: To specify that a student-athlete who is enrolled in a joint college/high school program for outstanding high school students

may participate in extracurricular activities (other than intercollegiate athletics), without using a term(s) of eligibility, provided the student is classified as a special student and is not considered by the college to be regularly matriculated.

Bylaws: Amend 14.2.3.3, page 117, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.2.3.3 Joint College/High-School Program. A student-athlete's eligibility under the five-year/10-semester rule does not begin while a student is enrolled in a collegiate institution in a joint high-school/college academic program for outstanding high-school students, in which the courses count as both high-school graduation credit and college credit, provided the student is classified as a special student; is not considered by the college to be regularly matriculated, and is not eligible for the college's extracurricular activities, including athletics programs."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the former NCAA Academic Requirements Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Members of the former Academic Requirements Committee believe that there have been an increase in the number of high-school students taking courses at collegiate institutions and that there are many instances in which students may be eligible to participate in certain extracurricular activities. Under such circumstances, a prospective student who is enrolled in a joint high-school/college academic program for outstanding high-school students should not begin his or her five years/10 semesters of eligibility, provided he or she is not eligible for the college's athletics program, is classified as a special student and is not considered by the college to be a regularly matriculated student.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 12 (NO. 2-8) ELIGIBILITY — ONE-TIME TRANSFER EXCEPTION — DIVISION II

Intent: In Division II, to permit a student-athlete who attended a four-year institution, did not receive athletically related financial aid and did not participate in intercollegiate athletics (other than in limited preseason tryouts) to exclude attendance at that institution for purposes of applying the one-time transfer exception.

Bylaws: Amend 14.5.5.3.11, pages 136-137, as follows:

[Division II]

"14.5.5.3.11 One-Time Transfer Exception. The student transfers to the certifying institution from another four-year collegiate institution and all of the following conditions are met (for graduate students, see also 14.1.7.1):

[14.5.5.3.11-(a) unchanged.]

“(b) The student has not transferred previously from one four-year institution unless, in the previous transfer, the student-athlete received an exception per 14.5.5.3.7 (discontinued/nonsponsored sport exception) **or the student-athlete did not receive athletically related aid and did not participate in intercollegiate athletics other than limited preseason tryouts at the previous institution;**”

[14.5.5.3.11-(c) through 14.5.5.3.11-(e) unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Huntsville; University of Arkansas, Monticello; Arkansas Tech University; University of Central Arkansas; Delta State University; Henderson State University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mississippi University for Women; University of Montevallo; University of North Alabama; Southern Arkansas University; Valdosta State University; University of West Alabama; University of West Florida; and State University of West Georgia.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: Under the current rule, attendance at a second four-year institution generally eliminates eligibility for the one-time transfer exception, regardless of whether the student-athlete was recruited to participate in intercollegiate athletics at the institution or actually participated in intercollegiate athletics at the institution. There have been an increasing number of situations where a student-athlete has participated at a four-year institution, has transferred to another four-year institution where he or she did not participate or receive athletics aid, and then attends a third institution. Under such circumstances, the student-athlete is required to fulfill an academic year in residence prior to representing the third institution in intercollegiate competition. The sponsors intend this proposal to relieve the burden of such cases going to the NCAA Administrative Review Panel by excluding attendance (for purposes of the one-time transfer exception) at a four-year institution if the transferring student did not receive athletics aid or participate in intercollegiate athletics (other than limited preseason tryouts) at the previous institution.

Action: Defeated.

PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS

NO. 13 (NO. 2-13) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISION II BASKETBALL — ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to exempt annually not more than two exhibition contests against a foreign team in the

United States from the maximum number of permissible basketball contests during any year in which it does not utilize an exempted contest against a “club” member of USA Basketball.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.2.3, pages 202-203, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.5.5.2.3 Division II. The following basketball contests each year may be exempted from a Division II institution’s maximum number of contests:

[17.5.5.2.3-(a) through 17.5.5.2.3-(c) unchanged.]

“(d) Foreign Team in U.S. An exhibition contest against a foreign team in the United States played in the arena in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests. **In Division II, an institution may play two exhibition contests against a foreign team in the United States during any year in which it does not utilize an exemption set forth in 17.5.5.3-(e);**”

[17.5.5.2.3-(e) through 17.5.5.2.3-(g) unchanged.]

Source: All members of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic and Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: The latitude of being able to play two exhibition contests (as opposed to one) against a foreign team in the United States enhances an institution’s opportunity to maximize to the fullest extent possible its use of the annual exemptions in the sport of basketball. In addition, since the contest must be played in the arena in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests, this legislation would provide an institution with an opportunity to generate additional revenue.

Committee Position (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 14 (NO. 2-14) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — DIVISION II BASKETBALL — ANNUAL EXEMPTIONS

Intent: To permit a Division II institution to exempt annually not more than two exhibition contests against a “club” member of USA Basketball from the maximum number of permissible basketball contests during any year in which it does not utilize an exempted contest against a foreign team in the United States.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.5.2.3, pages 202-203, as follows:

[Division II]

“17.5.5.2.3 Division II. The following basketball contests each year may be exempted from a Division II institution’s maximum number of contests:

[17.5.5.2.3-(a) through 17.5.5.2.3-(d) unchanged.]

"(e) USA Basketball Club. For Divisions I and II only, an exhibition contest against a "club" member of USA Basketball played in the arena in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests. **In Division II, an institution may play two exhibition contests against a "club" member of USA Basketball during any year in which it does not utilize the exemption set forth in 17.5.5.2.3-(d);**"

[17.5.5.2.3-(f) and 17.5.5.2.3-(g) unchanged.]

Source: All members of the North Central Intercollegiate Athletic and Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conferences.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: The latitude of being able to play two exhibition contests (instead of one) against a club team in the United States enhances an institution's opportunity to maximize to the fullest extent possible the use of the annual exemptions in the sport of basketball. In addition, since the contest must be played in the arena in which the member institution regularly plays its home contests, this legislation would provide an institution an opportunity to generate additional revenue.

Committee Position (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee supports this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 15 (NO. 2-16) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASON — SWIMMING AND DIVING

Intent: To permit a Division II student-athlete who is a diver to engage in diving practice sessions beyond the conclusion of the institution's swimming and diving playing season, provided any student-athlete does not engage in more than a 144-day playing season.

Bylaws: Amend 17.21.1 by adding new 17.21.1.1, page 246, as follows:
[Division II]

"17.21.1.1 Exception. A student-athlete who is a diver may engage in diving practice sessions beyond the conclusion of the institution's 144-day playing and practice season, provided the student-athlete does not engage in more than a 144-day playing season."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council upon recommendation from the NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: This proposal will help address circumstances unique to the sport of diving. The nature of the problem relates to the fact that the U.S. Diving National Championships take place in late

April, approximately one month after the NCAA Swimming and Diving National Championships in Divisions I, II and III. The start of the playing season is established by counting back from the conference championship, and because diving is combined with swimming for purposes of establishing the beginning of the playing season, the diving season starts at the same time as the swimming season. As a result, student-athletes who are divers who qualify for participation in the U.S. Diving National Championships are not permitted to receive coaching assistance (other than through the safety exception) from their collegiate coaches in preparation for and during the championship of the national governing body.

Action: Adopted.

GENERAL

NO. 16 (NO. 2-6) TRYOUTS — ENROLLED STUDENTS

Intent: To permit Division II institutions to conduct tryouts of currently enrolled students prior to the beginning of the playing and practice season under specified circumstances.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.12.2.1, page 96, as follows:

[Division II]

"13.12.2.1 Division II Tryouts. A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a prospect only on its campus or at a site at which it normally conducts practice or competition and only under the following conditions (see 17.02.12 for tryouts of currently enrolled students):"

[Remainder of 13.12.2.1 unchanged.]

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.02.1.1, pages 185-186, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.02.1.1 Countable Athletically Related Activities. The following are considered countable athletically related activities and must be counted in the weekly or daily time limitations specified under 17.1.6.1 for Divisions I and II:

[17.02.1.1-(a) through 17.02.1.1-(f) unchanged.]

"(g) In Division II only, required participation of student-athletes in permissible tryouts of involving prospective student-athletes per 13.12.2.1 or full-time students per 17.02.12. If participation occurs outside the institution's declared playing season it shall be counted as part of the conditioning activities specified in (c) above;"

[Remainder of 17.02.1.1 unchanged.]

C. Bylaws: Amend 17.02 by adding new 17.02.12, page 188, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II]

"17.02.12 Tryouts — Enrolled Student. A Division II member institution may conduct a tryout of a full-time student currently enrolled at the institution only on its campus or at a site at which the institution normally conducts practice or competition during the regular academic year. If such a tryout occurs prior to the beginning of the playing and practice season, the following conditions apply:

- "(a) No more than one tryout per student shall be permitted during any academic year;
- "(b) The student must not have been recruited (see 13.02.11.1);
- "(c) The student must be in good academic standing;
- "(d) A medical examination of a student conducted by an institution's regular team physician or other designated physician shall be permitted as a part of the tryout;
- "(e) The time of the tryout activities (other than the physical examination) shall be limited to the length of the institution's normal practice period in the sport, but in no event shall it be longer than two hours; and
- "(f) The institution may provide equipment and clothing on an issuance-and-retrieval basis to a student during the period of the tryout;
- "(g) No more than three dates may be used to conduct tryouts in each sport."

[17.02.12, renumbered as 17.02.13, unchanged.]

Source: University of Alabama, Huntsville; University of Arkansas, Monticello; Arkansas Tech University; University of Central Arkansas; Delta State University; Henderson State University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mississippi University for Women; University of Montevallo; University of North Alabama; Southern Arkansas University; Valdosta State University; University of West Alabama; University of West Florida; and State University of West Georgia.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: Currently, a student who is enrolled full time at a Division II institution may not tryout for an institution's team prior to the start of the season in that sport. This prevents a student from assessing whether he or she has the ability to play for his or her institution. This legislation will enable a student to better assess his or her athletics ability and assist them in determining whether playing at the Division II level is an option.

Committee Position (Division II Legislation Committee): The committee took no position on this proposal.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 17 (NO. 2-17) ENFORCEMENT — PENALTIES FOR SECONDARY VIOLATIONS

Intent: In Division II, to permit selected secondary violations that have occurred for the first time in a particular sport, and for which the Division II Committee on Infractions has prescribed appropriate disciplinary or corrective actions for such violations, to be processed at the conference level.

- A. Bylaws: Amend 19.1.2.1.1, page 278, as follows:

[Division II]

"19.1.2.1.1 Authority of Conference Commissioners. Selected secondary violations that have been identified by the Division II Committee on Infractions, and for which specific disciplinary or corrective actions have been prescribed by the Division II Committee on Infractions, may be processed by the commissioner of the member institution's conference when such violations occur for the first time in a particular sport. Those violations that temporarily affect the individual eligibility of a prospective or enrolled student-athlete (as indicated on the prescribed penalty schedule) must continue to be handled through the normal eligibility restoration process. The conference commissioner, at his or her discretion, may elect not to process any such violation and, instead, forward it to the Division II Committee on Infractions. Any violations processed and penalties imposed by the conference commissioner shall be reported to the Division II Committee on Infractions on a monthly basis. If an institution believes that a case warrants action that is less than the prescribed penalty, it may request further review by the group executive director for enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement."

- B. Bylaws: Amend 32.4 by adding new 32.4.1, page 359, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division II]

"32.4.1 Authority of Conference Commissioners. Selected secondary violations that have been identified by the Division II Committee on Infractions, and for which specific disciplinary or corrective actions have been prescribed by the Division II Committee on Infractions, may be processed by the commissioner of the member institution's conference when such violations occur for the first time in a particular sport. Those violations that temporarily affect the individual eligibility of a prospective or enrolled student-athlete (as indicated on the prescribed penalty schedule) must continue to be handled through the normal eligibility restoration process. The conference commissioner, at his or her discretion, may elect not to process any such violation and, instead, forward it to the

Division II Committee on Infractions. Any violations processed and penalties imposed by the conference commissioner shall be reported to the Division II Committee on Infractions on a monthly basis. If an institution believes that a case warrants action that is less than the prescribed penalty, it may request further review by the group executive director for enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement."

Source: University of Alabama, Huntsville; University of Arkansas, Monticello; Arkansas Tech University; University of Central Arkansas; Delta State University; Henderson State University; Lincoln Memorial University; Mississippi University for Women; University of Montevallo; University of North Alabama; Southern Arkansas University; Valdosta State University; University of West Alabama; University of West Florida; and State University of West Georgia.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: Under current legislation, only the NCAA Committee on Infractions and the group executive director for enforcement and student-athlete reinstatement can impose disciplinary or corrective actions related to secondary violations. In the spirit of deregulation, this proposal would vest in the conference commissioners the authority to rule on selected institutional secondary violations when such violations occur for the first time in a particular sport. This will reduce the workload for the NCAA enforcement staff and the Committee on Infractions as it relates to processing institutional secondary violations, thus, resulting in a more expeditious review of these cases. Because the disciplinary or corrective action for the particular secondary violations will be the same in all instances, there will be consistency in uniformity in the processing of all such cases. Further, the commissioner would remain responsible for reporting all violations and decisions to the Committee on Infractions on a monthly basis.

Action: Defeated.

NO. 18 (NO. 2-18) NCAA CORE-COURSE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Intent: To establish a standing common core-course review committee to assist in the development of policies related to the identification of core courses, and to review courses in the various academic disciplines (i.e., English, mathematics, natural/physical science, social studies and additional courses) that have been denied by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse for use in meeting the initial-eligibility core-curriculum standards.

[Note: The proposed committee would be established as a common committee, inasmuch as it will review courses denied by the clearinghouse for use in meeting both the Divisions I and II initial-eligibility requirements. Thus, the committee must be approved by both

the Divisions I and II membership acting independently through their own governance structures.]

Bylaws: Amend 21.5 by adding new 21.5.4, page 306, as follows:

[Common provision, Divisions I and II, divided vote]

"21.5.4 NCAA Core-Course Review Committee

"21.5.4.1 Composition.

"(a) The committee shall consist of 18 members who comprise subcommittees in the various academic disciplines as follows:

"(1) English — Four members;

"(2) Mathematics — Four members;

"(3) Natural/Physical Science — Four members;

"(4) Social Studies — Four members; and

"(5) Additional Academic Courses — Two members.

"(b) The committee shall elect one member to serve as a chair for each subcommittee;

"(c) The committee may utilize as it determines necessary additional members to review core courses in the various academic disciplines; and

"(d) The Division II members of the common Core-Course Review Committee shall be appointed by and report directly to the Division II Academic Requirements Committee.

"21.5.4.2 Duties. The committee shall assist in the development of policies related to the identification of core courses and oversee the review of all core courses denied by the NCAA Initial-Eligibility Clearinghouse as meeting the initial-eligibility core-curriculum standards."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: It is extremely important to ensure that there is consistency between Divisions I and II in the use of core courses by entering freshmen in meeting the initial-eligibility core-curriculum requirements. Under the old structure, a subcommittee of the former Academic Requirements Committee handled that function for both divisions. The establishment of a common committee in the new structure, modeled after the previous subcommittee, will ensure that the review process continues in a consistent manner.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 19 (NO. 2-19) DIVISION II MEN'S AND WOMEN'S TENNIS COMMITTEE

Intent: To increase the Division II Men's and Women's Tennis Committee.

mittee from six to eight members; further, to specify that four members of the committee shall represent men's tennis interests and four members shall represent women's tennis interests, including three positions allocated for men, three allocated for women and two unallocated.

Bylaws: Amend 21.7.7.14, page 312, as follows:
[Division II]

"21.7.7.14 Tennis Committee, Men's and Women's — Division II. The Division II Men's and Women's Tennis Committee shall consist of *six* **eight** members. *Three* **Four** members of the committee shall represent men's tennis interests and *three* **four** members shall represent women's tennis interests, including *two* **three** positions allocated for men, *two* **three** allocated for women and two unallocated."

Source: NCAA Division II Presidents Council (Division II Management Council).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: Tennis is the only Division II sports committee in which its composition does not match its regional alignment. Currently, tennis has four regions but only three representatives for men's tennis interests and three representatives for women's tennis interests. The adoption of this proposal would provide for similar composition requirements for all Division II sports committees.

Action: Adopted.

DIVISION III LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

*NO. 20 (NO. 2-20) GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Intent: To specify that the provisions of Bylaw 10.3 are applicable to staff members of member conferences.

Bylaws: Amend 10.3, page 49, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"10.3 GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

"Staff members of a **member conference**, **staff members** of the athletics department of a member institution and student-athletes shall not knowingly."

[Remainder of 10.3 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (former NCAA Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: This proposal will help to address continued concerns of the Association related to gambling activities by expanding

the scope of the legislation to apply to conference staff members as well as institutional staff members and student-athletes.

Action: Adopted, 273-9-2.

*NO. 21 (NO. 2-24) PLAYING AND PRACTICE SEASONS — PRESEASON PRACTICE — DIVISION III BASKETBALL

Intent: To permit Division III institutions to commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions on October 15.

Bylaws: Amend 17.5.2.1, page 159, as follows:
[Division III, roll call]

"17.5.2.1 On-Court Practice. A member institution shall not commence on-court preseason basketball practice sessions prior to the following dates:

"(a) Division I — The Saturday nearest October 15; **and**

"(b) Divisions II **and** III — October 15; **and**

"(c) Division III — The fourth Saturday preceding the first permissible contest date per 17.5.3-(d)."

Source: Defiance College, Guilford College, Wesleyan College and all members of the Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: This proposal to permit on-court practice beginning October 15 will provide more instruction time for student-athletes. It will enable coaches to commence teaching fundamental skills and techniques and utilize equipment on the first permissible date on which coaches may have contact with student-athletes. These activities may include "chalk talks," video review and skill workouts. Under current legislation, it is permissible for conditioning activities to begin October 15, so this proposal will not result in an increase in the demand on any student-athlete's time.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council): The Division III Management Council recommended to the Division III Presidents Council that it oppose this proposal. It noted that it is not necessary to lengthen the permissible on-court practice period. Further, the proposal would negatively affect many multisport student-athletes.

Action: Withdrawn.

*NO. 22 (NO. 2-25) MAXIMUM DATES OF COMPETITION — WOMEN'S LACROSSE — DIVISION III

Intent: In Division III, to permit a member institution in the sport

of women's lacrosse to engage in 17 dates of competition during the traditional segment and five dates of competition during the nontraditional segment.

A. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.1, page 187, as follows:

[Division III, roll call]

"17.14.5.1 Maximum Limitations — Institutional. In all divisions, a member institution shall limit its total playing schedule with outside competition in the sport of lacrosse during the institution's lacrosse playing season to 17 dates of competition in men's lacrosse and Divisions II and III women's lacrosse, and 17 dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted (**traditional segment in Division III**) and five dates of competition during *another the other* segment (**nontraditional segment Division III**) in Divisions I and III women's lacrosse, except for those dates of competition excluded under 17.14.5.2, 17.14.5.3, 17.14.5.4, 17.14.5.5, 17.14.5.6 and 17.14.5.7."

B. Bylaws: Amend 17.14.5.1.2, page 187, as follows:

[Division III]

"17.14.5.1.2 Maximum Limitations — Student-Athlete. An individual student-athlete may participate in each academic year in not more than 17 dates of competition in men's lacrosse and Divisions II and III women's lacrosse, and 17 dates of competition during the segment in which the NCAA championship is conducted (**traditional segment in Division III**) and five dates of competition during *another the other* segment (**nontraditional segment in Division III**) in Divisions I and III women's lacrosse. This limitation includes those contests in which the student represents the institution in accordance with 17.02.8, including competition as a member of the varsity, junior varsity or freshman team of the institution."

Source: Hobart and William Smith Colleges and all members of the State University of New York Athletic Conference.

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: This proposal would allow Division III institutions to provide the same participation opportunities during the nontraditional segment in women's lacrosse that currently apply in the sports of field hockey and soccer.

Committee Position (Division III Management Council): The Division III Management Council recommended to the Division III Presidents Council that it oppose this proposal based on concerns related to safety and conditioning, equity (no similar proposal for men's lacrosse) and the further establishment of the nontraditional season.

Action: Defeated, 62-162-43.

NO. 23 (NO. 2-21) EXPENSES FOR PARTICIPATION IN OLYMPIC EXHIBITIONS

Intent: To permit individuals to receive actual and necessary expenses to participate in Olympic tours/exhibitions involving Olympic team members and members of the national team.

A. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.1.4.3 by adding new 12.1.1.1.4.3.1, page 56, as follows:

[Division III]

"**12.1.1.1.4.3.1 Expenses for Participation in Olympic Exhibitions.** Expenses received from the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC) or national governing body (NGB) to participate in Olympic tours or exhibitions involving Olympic team members and/or members of the national team, provided that if the individual is a student-athlete, he or she misses no class time and the exhibition does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

B. Bylaws: Amend 12.1.1.1.4.5 by adding new 12.1.1.1.4.5.1, page 57, as follows:

[Division III]

"**12.1.1.1.4.5.1 Expenses for Participation in Olympic Exhibitions.** Actual and necessary expenses to participate in Olympic tours or exhibitions from a sponsor other than the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC), national governing body (NGB) or nonprofessional organizations sponsoring the event, provided that if the individual is a student-athlete, he or she misses no class time and the exhibition does not conflict with dates of institutional competition."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (NCAA Olympic Sports Liaison Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998.

Rationale: Under current NCAA amateurism regulations, individuals may receive actual and necessary expenses from an outside amateur sports team or organization or nonprofessional organization only to participate in actual competition (i.e., events that involve either competition against an outside team or the scoring of actual place finish in the event). This proposal will permit individuals to receive actual and necessary expenses to participate in Olympic tours/exhibitions involving Olympic team members and members of the national team, even if the activities include no formal competition, provided that if the individual is a student-athlete, he or she misses no class time and the exhibition does not conflict with dates of institutional competition. The Olympic Sports Liaison Committee believes that this proposal is consistent with other more permissive NCAA amateurism rules governing other USOC and NGB activities.

Action: Adopted.

Intent: To specify circumstances in which an institution does not have to declare ineligible and seek restoration on behalf of an individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) who received an improper benefit while a prospect, provided the individual repays the value of the improper benefit.

A. Bylaws: Amend 13.2.1, page 73, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.2.1 General Regulation. An institution's staff member or any representative of its athletics interests shall not be involved, directly, or indirectly, in making arrangements for or giving or offering to give any financial aid or other benefits to the prospect or the prospect's relatives or friends other than expressly permitted by NCAA regulation. This prohibition shall apply regardless of whether similar financial aid, benefits or arrangements are available to prospective students in general, their relatives or friends. **For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.**"

B. Bylaws: Amend 13.2.2 by adding new 13.2.2.1, page 74, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.2.2.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.2.2 in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

C. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.1, page 75, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.6.1 General Restrictions. An institution may not provide

transportation to a prospect other than on the official paid visit or, on an unofficial visit, to view a practice or competition site and other institutional facilities (located within a 30-mile radius of the institution's campus) when accompanied by an institutional staff member. However, an institution may not provide transportation to attend one of the institution's home contests (on or off campus) during the unofficial visit. **For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the offer or inducement is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the prospect repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff.**"

D. Bylaws: Amend 13.6.2 by adding new 13.6.2.9, page 77, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.6.2.9 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.6.2 in which the value of the transportation is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1 and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

E. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.1, page 78, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.7.5.1 (Entertainment/Tickets on Official Visit) General Restrictions. An institution may provide entertainment, which may not be excessive, on the official visit only for a prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse and only within a 30-mile radius of the institution's main campus. Entertainment and contact by the representatives of the institution's athletics interests during the official visit are prohibited in Division I and confined to campus in Division II. It is not permissible to entertain other relatives or friends (including dates) of a prospect at any time at any site. **For violations of this bylaw in which the value of the entertainment is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall re-**

main ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

F. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.2, page 78, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.7.5.2 (Entertainment/Tickets on Official Visit) Complimentary Admissions. During the official visit, complimentary admissions to a campus athletics event may be provided only to a prospect and the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse. Such admissions may provide seating only in the general seating area of the facility utilized for conducting the event. Providing seating during the conduct of the event (including intermission) for the prospect or the prospect's parents [or legal guardian(s)] or spouse in the facility's press box, special seating box(es) or bench area is specifically prohibited. **For violations of this bylaw in which the individual receives an excessive number of complimentary admissions, and the value of the excessive admissions if \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."**

G. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.5 by adding new 13.7.5.5.1, page 79, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.7.5.5.1 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.7.5.5 in which the value of the benefit to the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

H. Bylaws: Amend 13.7.5.7 by adding new 13.7.5.7.2, page 79, renumbering subsequent sections, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.7.5.7.2 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefits. For violations of 13.7.5.7.1 in which the value of the excessive meals is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

I. Bylaws: Amend 13.8.2 by adding new 13.8.2.7, page 81, as follows:

[Division III]

"13.8.2.7 Eligibility Ramifications — Restitution for Receipt of Improper Benefit. For violations of 13.8.2 in which the value of the entertainment/tickets/meal is \$25 or less, the eligibility of the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) shall not be affected conditioned upon the individual repaying the value of the benefit to a charity of his or her choice. The individual, however, shall remain ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the impermissible benefit until the individual repays the benefit. Violations of this bylaw remain institutional violations per 2.8.1, and documentation of the individual's repayment shall be forwarded to the enforcement staff."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (former NCAA Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal represents a new concept created by the former Eligibility Committee and is designed to eliminate the ineligibility component for those violations of NCAA rules in which the action by the committee is to require repayment or restitution in order for the individual (i.e., prospective or enrolled student-athlete) to regain his or her eligibility. These proposals will not require the involved institution to declare the individual (prospect or student-athlete) ineligible and seek restoration of eligibility; rather, these proposals require the individual to repay the value of the benefit in order to regain eligible status. The individual remains ineligible from the time the institution has knowledge of the receipt of the benefit until such time repayment has been documented by the institution. Violations of these provisions remain violations that have institutional responsibility and documentation of repayment shall be submitted to the enforcement staff with the institution's self-report.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 25 (NO. 2-23) DE MINIMIS VIOLATIONS — PROSPECTIVE AND ENROLLED STUDENT-ATHLETES

Intent: To specify instances in which a de minimis violation will not render a prospective or enrolled student-athlete ineligible while retaining the fact that such a violation shall be considered an institutional violation.

- A. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.5.1, page 75, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.4.5.1 Recruiting Advertisements. The publication of advertising or promotional material, by or on behalf of a member institution, designed to solicit the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete is not permitted. Accordingly, a member institution may not buy or arrange to have space in game programs or other printed materials published to provide information concerning the athletics participation or evaluation of prospects (e.g., recruiting publications) for any purpose whatsoever, including advertisements, a listing of prospective or enrolled student-athletes who will attend the institution and informative materials related to the institution. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

- B. Bylaws:** Amend 13.4.5.3, page 75, as follows:
[Division III]

"13.4.5.3 Miscellaneous Promotions. Member institutions and their representatives of athletics interests are prohibited from financing, arranging or utilizing recruiting aids (e.g., newspaper advertisements, bumper stickers, message buttons) designed to publicize the institution's interest in a particular prospect. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the prospective student-athlete's eligibility.**"

- C. Bylaws:** Amend 16.8.1.2, page 134, as follows:
[Division III]

"16.8.1.2 Competition While Representing Institution. An institution may provide actual and necessary travel expenses (e.g., transportation, lodging and meals) to a student-athlete for participation in athletics competition, provided the student-athlete is representing the institution (competes in the uniform of the institution) and is eligible for collegiate competition. **Violations of this bylaw shall be considered institutional violations per 2.8.1; however, they shall not affect the student-athlete's eligibility.** Such competition includes:"

[Remainder of 16.8.1.2 unchanged.]

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (former NCAA Eligibility Committee).

Effective Date: Immediately.*

Rationale: This proposal is similar to proposals adopted at the 1996 and 1997 NCAA Conventions, and is an attempt to decrease the number of circumstances in which an institution is required to declare a prospective or enrolled student-athlete ineligible (as a result of the prospect's or student-athlete's involvement in a violation of NCAA rules) in instances in which the prospect or student-athlete did not receive a benefit and little or no recruiting or competitive advantage occurs. Currently, violations of the three paragraphs in this proposal always result in immediate restoration of eligibility without conditions imposed. It is important to note, however, that although violations of these provisions would have no individual eligibility ramifications, the institution still would need to self-report the violation to the enforcement staff at the NCAA national office, and the NCAA Committee on Infractions would remain responsible for assessing institutional responsibility.

Action: Adopted.

NO. 26 (NO. 2-26) MEMBERSHIP RECLASSIFICATION — DIVISION III

Intent: To revise the criteria for institutions that wish to reclassify into Division III as specified.

Bylaws: Amend 20.5.2.3, page 256, as follows:
[Division III]

"20.5.2.3 Compliance With Criteria. If the member has met all applicable membership criteria of this article for the **Division III** to which it intends to transfer and has complied for the **two three** years preceding June 1 with all other **Division III** bylaw requirements (other than the Division III financial aid requirements set forth in 15.4, except that athletically related financial aid may not be awarded to incoming freshmen or transfer students), the member shall be transferred to the new **Division III** effective the September 1 that the institution selects as its effective date.

"20.5.2.3.1 Financial Aid Exception. During the first year of compliance, the member is not required to comply with the financial aid requirements set forth in 15.4, except that athletically related financial aid may not be awarded to incoming freshmen or transfer students. During the second and third years, the member must comply with all financial aid requirements set forth in 15.4.

"20.5.2.3.2 Institutional Self-Study Requirement. An institution reclassifying into Division III must complete a Division III Institutional Self-Study Guide

(ISSG) during the first year of its three-year compliance period."

Source: NCAA Division III Presidents Council (NCAA Membership Committee).

Effective Date: August 1, 1998, for institutions that begin the initial year of the compliance period during the 1998-99 academic year.

Rationale: This proposal will ensure that institutions that wish to reclassify their athletics programs into Division III will be fully committed to the Division III philosophy. An institution that wishes to reclassify its athletics program into Division III must show compliance with the Division III requirements for a three-year period prior to reclassification, with the exception of financial requirements during the first year of compliance. The reclassifying institution shall be precluded, however, from awarding any athletically related financial aid to incoming freshmen and transfer students during the entire three-year period. Finally, institutions reclassifying into Division III shall be required to complete an Institutional Self-Study Guide (ISSG) during the first year of the three-year compliance period.

Action: Adopted.

Appendix B

Roll-Call Voting

This is a summary of the roll-call votes that were conducted at the 1998 NCAA Convention in Atlanta, Georgia.

Each column represents a roll-call vote at the Convention. The number at the head of each column is the proposal number. Where letters are indicated, the reference is to parts of multipart proposals included in that vote. Proposals considered in more than one division business session are reported in separate columns labeled by division.

DIVISION II

Institution	1	2	3	4	6	7
Abilene Christian	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Adams State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adelphi	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Alabama A&M				Yes		
Alabama-Huntsville	Yes	Yes		Abs		
Alaska Anchorage	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Alaska Fairbanks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Albany State (Georgia)	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Albany (New York)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Alderson-Broaddus	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
American International	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
American (Puerto Rico)				No		
Angelo State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Arkansas Tech	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Arkansas-Monticello	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Armstrong Atlantic State	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Ashland	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Assumption						
Augusta State		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Augustana (South Dakota)	Yes	No		No	Yes	
Barry	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs	Abs
Barton	Yes			Yes		
Bellarmino	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Belmont Abbey						
Bemidji State	Yes	Yes	No		Yes	Yes
Bentley				Yes		
Bloomsburg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Bluefield State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Bowie State				Yes		
Bridgeport				Yes		
Bryant				No	No	
California Collegiate Athletic Assn.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs		
California Davis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
California Riverside	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	
Cal Poly Pomona	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cal State Bakersfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cal State Chico	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cal State Dominguez Hills	Yes	Yes	No	Abs		
Cal State Hayward	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Cal State Los Angeles	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cal State San Bernardino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cal State Stanislaus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
California (Pennsylvania)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Cameron	Yes	Yes	No	Abs	Abs	Abs
Carolinas-Virginia Athletic Conf.	Yes	No	No	Yes		
Carson-Newman	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Catawba	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Central Arkansas	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		Yes
Central Intercollegiate Athletic Assn.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Central Missouri State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Central Oklahoma	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Chadron State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chaminade	Yes	Abs	Yes	Yes		
Charleston (West Virginia)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Cheyney	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clarion	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clark Atlanta	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Clayton State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Coker			No	Yes		
Colorado Christian	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Colorado School of Mines	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Colorado-Colorado Springs	Yes					
Columbia Union					Yes	Yes
Columbus State				Yes	Yes	
Concord	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Concordia (New York)				Yes		
Davis & Elkins	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Delta State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Denver						
District of Columbia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Dowling	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Drury	Yes			Yes		
East Stroudsburg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Eastern New Mexico	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Eckerd						
Edinboro		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Elizabeth City State			No	Yes	No	
Elon						
Emporia State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Erskine	Yes	Yes	No			
Fairmont State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fayette State	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Ferris State	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Florida Tech	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Florida Southern						
Fort Hays State	Yes			Yes		Yes
Fort Lewis	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Fort Valley State			No			Yes
Francis Marion						
Franklin Pierce	Yes	Yes	No			
Gannon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Gardner-Webb	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Georgia C&Su	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Glenville State		Yes	No	Yes	Yes	
Grand Canyon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Grand Valley State						
Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Great Lakes Valley Conf.	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Gulf South Conf.	Yes	Yes	No		No	
Harding	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Hawaii-Hilo				Yes		
Henderson State	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
High Point						
Hillsdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Humboldt State	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Incarnate Word						
Indiana/Purdue-Indianapolis						

Institution	1	2	3	4	6	7
Indiana (Pennsylvania).....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Indiana/Purdue-Fl. Wayne.....	Yes	Yes	Abs	No		
Indianapolis.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Johnson C. Smith.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Kennesaw State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Kentucky State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Kentucky Wesleyan.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Kutztown.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lake Superior State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Lander.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Lane.....						
Le Moyne.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Lemoine-Owen.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Lees-McRae.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Lenoir-Rhyne.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Lewis.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Limestone.....		Yes	Yes			
Lincoln Memorial.....						
Lincoln (Missouri).....	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Livingston.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Lock Haven.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lone Star Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Long Island-C. W. Post.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Longwood.....	Yes	Yes	Abs			
Lynn.....		Yes				
Mankato State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mansfield.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Mars Hill.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Massachusetts-Lowell.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Abs	Yes
Mercy.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Mercyhurst.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Merrimack.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Mesa State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Metropolitan State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Michigan Tech.....	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Mid-America Intercollegiate Athletics Assn.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Midwestern State.....						
Miles.....						
Millersville.....						
Minnesota-Duluth.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minnesota-Morris.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Mississippi University For Women.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Missouri Southern State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Missouri Western State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Missouri-Rolla.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Missouri-St. Louis.....	Yes	Yes	No	Abs		
Molloy.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Montana State-Billings.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Montevallo.....	No	Yes				
Moorhead State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Morehouse.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Morningside.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Morris Brown.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Mount Olive.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Nebraska-Kearney.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nebraska-Omaha.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
New England Collegiate Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
New Hampshire Col.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
New Haven.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
New Jersey Institute of Technology.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs
New Mexico Highlands.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Abs
New York Collegiate Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes			
New York Tech.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Newberry.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
North Alabama.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
North Carolina-Pembroke.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
North Carolina Central.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes

Institution	1	2	3	4	6	7
North Dakota State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
North Dakota.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
North Florida.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Northeast-10 Conf.....	Yes	Abs	Yes	No	Yes	
Northern California Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Northern Colorado.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Northern Kentucky.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Northern Michigan.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Northern State.....	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conf.....	Yes	Yes	No	Abs	Yes	Yes
Northwest Missouri State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Northwood.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Notre Dame (California).....						
Oakland City.....						
Lewis.....						
Ouachita Baptist.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Pace.....	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes
Paine.....						
Peach Belt Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Pennsylvania State Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Pfeiffer.....		Yes	Yes	Yes		
Philadelphia Textile.....	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Pittsburg State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Pittsburg-Johnstown.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Portland State.....						
Presbyterian.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Queens (North Carolina).....						
Queens (New York).....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Quincy.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Quinnipiac.....						
Regis (Colorado).....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Rocky Mountain Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Rollins.....	Yes	No	Yes	No		
Sacred Heart.....						
Saginaw Valley State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Salem-Teikyo.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Abs	
San Francisco State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Savannah State.....						
Seattle Pacific.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Shaw.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
Shepherd.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Shippensburg.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Slippery Rock.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sonoma State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
South Atlantic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
South Carolina-Aiken.....						
South Carolina-Spartanburg.....	Yes	Yes				
South Dakota State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
South Dakota.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Southampton.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Southern Arkansas.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Southern Colorado.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Southern Connecticut State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Southern Illinois-Edwardsville.....	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Southern Indiana.....	Yes	Yes	No	No		
Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Abs	
Southwest Baptist.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Southwest State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
St. Andrews Presbyterian.....	Yes	Yes	Yes			
St. Anselm.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
St. Augustine's.....	Yes	Yes	Yes			
St. Cloud State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
St. Francis (Illinois).....						
St. Joseph's (Indiana).....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
St. Leo.....	Yes	Yes				
St. Michael's.....	Yes	Yes	Yes			
St. Paul's.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
St. Rose.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Stonehill.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Story Brook.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

Institution	1	2	3	4	6	7
Sunshine State Conf.....						
Tampa.....	Yes					
Tarleton State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Texas A&M-Commerce.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Texas A&M-Kingsville.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Texas Woman's University.....	Yes	Yes	No			
Truman State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Tuskegee.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Valdosta State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Virginia State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Virginia Union.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Washburn.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wayne State (Michigan).....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wayne State (Nebraska).....	Abs	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
West Alabama.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
West Chester.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Institution	1	2	3	4	6	7
West Florida.....	Yes	Yes	No	No		
West Georgia State.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
West Liberty State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	
West Texas A&M.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
West Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
West Virginia State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes		
West Virginia Tech.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
West Virginia Wesleyan.....	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Western New Mexico.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
Western State.....						
Wheeling Jesuit.....	Yes	Yes	Yes			
Wingate.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Winona State.....	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Winston-Salem State.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Wisconsin-Parkside.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

DIVISION III

Institution	20	22
Adrian.....	Yes	Abs
Agnes Scott.....	Yes	No
Albertus Magnus.....	Yes	Abs
Albion.....	Yes	Yes
Albright.....	Yes	Yes
Alfred.....	Yes	No
Allegheny.....	Yes	Yes
Allentown.....	Yes	Yes
Alma.....	Yes	Yes
Alvernia.....	Yes	No
Amherst.....	Yes	No
Anderson (Indiana).....	Yes	Abs
Anna Maria.....		
Augusta.....	Yes	No
Augustana (Illinois).....	Yes	No
Aurora.....	Yes	No
Austin.....	Yes	No
Averett.....	Yes	No
Babson.....	Yes	No
Baldwin-Wallace.....	Yes	No
Bard.....	Yes	No
Bates.....	Yes	No
Beaver.....	Yes	No
Beloit.....	Yes	No
Benedictine.....	Yes	No
Bennett.....	Yes	No
Bernard Baruch.....	Yes	No
Bethany College (West Virginia).....	No	
Bethel (Minnesota).....		
Binghamton.....		
Blackburn.....	No	
Bluffton.....	Yes	Yes
Bowdoin.....	Yes	Yes
Brandeis.....	Yes	Yes
Bridgewater (Virginia).....	Yes	No
Bridgewater State (Massachusetts).....	Yes	No
Brookport State.....		
Brooklyn.....		
Bryn Mawr.....	Yes	No
Buena Vista.....		
Buffalo State.....	Yes	Yes
Cabrini.....		
California-San Diego.....	Yes	Abs
California-Santa Cruz.....		
Cal Tech.....	Yes	Yes
Cal Lutheran.....	Yes	Yes
Calvin.....	Yes	No
Capital Athletic Conf.....	Yes	No
Capital.....	Yes	No
Carleton.....	Yes	No

Institution	20	22
Carnegie Mellon Univ.....	Yes	No
Carroll (Wisconsin).....		
Carthage.....	Yes	No
Case Western Reserve.....	Yes	No
Castleton State.....	Yes	No
Catholic.....	Yes	No
Cazenovia.....	Yes	No
Cedar Crest.....	Yes	No
Centenary (New Jersey).....		
Centennial Conf.....		
Central (Iowa).....	Yes	No
Centre.....	Yes	No
Chapman.....	No	
Chatham.....	Yes	No
Chestnut Hill.....	Yes	Yes
Chicago.....	Yes	No
Chowan.....	Yes	No
Christopher Newport.....	Yes	No
City University of New York Athletic Conf.....	Yes	Yes
Claremont-Mudd-Scripps.....	Yes	Yes
Clark (Massachusetts).....	Yes	Yes
Clarke.....	Yes	Yes
Clarkson.....	Yes	Yes
Coe.....	Yes	Yes
Colby.....	Yes	No
Colby-Sawyer.....	Yes	No
College Conf of Illinois and Wisconsin.....	Yes	No
College Misericordia.....	Yes	Yes
Colorado College.....	Yes	No
Commonwealth.....	Yes	No
Coast Conf.....	Yes	No
Concordia-Moorhead.....	Yes	Yes
Concordia (Illinois).....	Yes	Yes
Concordia (Wisconsin).....	Yes	No
Connecticut College.....	Yes	No
Constitution Athletic Conf.....	Yes	No
Cornell College.....	Yes	No
Cortland State.....	Yes	No
Curry.....	Yes	No
Dallas.....	Yes	Abs
Daniel Webster.....	Yes	Yes
De Pauw.....	Yes	No
Defiance.....	Yes	Yes
Delaware Valley.....	Yes	Yes
Denison.....	Yes	No
Dickinson.....	Yes	No
Division III Independents.....		
Dixie Intercollegiate Athletic Conf.....	Yes	No
Drew.....	Yes	No

Institution	20	22	Institution	20	22	Institution	20	22	Institution	20	22	Institution	20	22	Institution	20	22
Hampden-Sydney.....Yes	Abs		Massachusetts Liberal Arts.....Yes	No		Old Dominion Athletic Conf.Yes	Yes		St. Joseph's (New York).....Yes	Yes		University Athletic Assn.Yes	Yes		Wheelock.....		
Hanover.....Yes	No		Massachusetts State.....			Old Westbury.....Yes	Yes		St. Joseph's (Maine).....			Upper Iowa.....			Whitman College.....		
Hardin-Simmons.....			College Athletic Conf.Yes	No		Olivet.....Yes	Yes	No	St. Lawrence.....Yes	No		Upstate Collegiate.....			Whittier.....Yes	No	
Hartwick.....Yes	Yes		Massachusetts Pharmacy.....			Oneonta State.....			St. Louis Intercollegiate.....			Athletic Assn.Yes	No		Whitworth.....		
Haverford.....Yes	No		MIT.....Yes	No		Oswego State.....Yes	Yes		Athletic Conf.Yes	No		Ursinus.....Yes	No		Widener.....Yes	No	
Heidelberg.....Yes	No		Massachusetts Maritime.....No	Abs		Otterbein.....Yes	Abs		St. Mary's (Indiana).....Yes	Abs		Utica.....			Wilkes.....Yes	Abs	
Hendrix.....Yes	No		Massachusetts-Boston.....Yes			Ozarks (Arkansas).....			St. Mary's (Maryland).....Yes	No		Utica/Rome.....			Willamette.....		
Hilbert.....			Massachusetts-Dartmouth.....Yes	Yes		Pacific (Oregon).....			St. Mary's (Minnesota).....Yes	Abs		Vassar.....Yes	No		William Patterson.....Yes	Abs	
Hiram.....Yes	No		McMurry.....Yes	Abs		Penn State-Behrend.....Yes	No		St. Norbert.....			Villa Julie.....			William Penn.....Yes	No	
Hobart and William Smith.....Yes	Yes		Medgar Evers.....Yes	No		Pennsylvania Athletic Conf.			St. Olaf.....Yes	Abs		Virginia Wesleyan.....			Williams.....Abs	No	
Hollins.....Yes	Abs		Menlo.....			Pine Manor.....			St. Scholastica.....			Wabash.....Yes	No		Wilmington (Ohio).....		
Hood.....			Meredith.....			Pittsburgh-Bradford.....			St. Thomas (Minnesota).....Yes	Abs		Wartburg.....Yes	Yes		Wilson.....		
Hope.....Yes	No		Messiah.....Yes	No		Plattsburgh State.....Yes	Yes		State University of.....			Washington and Jefferson.....Yes	No		Wisconsin Intercollegiate.....		
Howard Payne.....Yes	Abs		Methodist.....Yes	Yes		Plymouth State.....Yes	No		New York Athletic Conf.			Washington and Lee.....Yes	No		Athletic Conf.		
Hunter.....Yes	No		Michigan Intercollegiate.....			Polytechnic (New York).....			Staten Island.....Yes	Yes		Washington (Maryland).....Yes	No		Wisconsin Lutheran.....		
Illinois College.....			Athletic Assn.Yes	Abs		Pomona-Pitzer.....Yes	No		Stevens Tech.....Yes	No		Washington (Missouri).....Yes	Yes		Wisconsin-Eau Claire.....Yes	No	
Illinois Wesleyan.....Yes			Middle Atlantic States Conf.Yes	No		Potsdam State.....			Stillman.....			Waynesburg.....			Wisconsin-La Crosse.....Yes	Abs	
Immaculata.....Yes	No		Middlebury.....Yes	No		Presidents Athletic Conf.			Suffolk.....Yes	No		Webster.....Yes	No		Wisconsin-Oshkosh.....Yes	No	
Indiana Collegiate.....			Midwest Conf.Yes			Principia.....Yes	No		Sul Ross State.....Yes	Yes		Wellesley.....Yes	No		Wisconsin-Platteville.....Yes	Abs	
Athletic Conf.Yes	No		Milikin.....Yes	Abs		Puget Sound.....			Susquehanna.....Yes	Yes		Wells.....			Wisconsin-River Falls.....Yes	Abs	
Iowa Intercollegiate.....			Mills.....			Ramapo.....			Swarthmore.....			Wentworth Institute.....Yes	No		Wisconsin-Stevens Point.....Yes	No	
Athletic Conf.Yes	Abs		Millsaps.....Yes	No		Randolph-Macon.....Yes	Yes		Sweet Briar.....Yes	No		Wesley.....			Wisconsin-Stout.....No	No	
Ithaca.....Yes	Yes		Milwaukee School.....Yes	Yes		Randolph-Macon Woman's.....Yes	Yes		Thiel.....Yes	No		Wesleyan (Georgia).....			Wisconsin-Superior.....Yes	No	
Jersey City State.....Yes	No		of Engineering.....Yes			Redlands.....			Thomas More.....			Wesleyan (Connecticut).....No			Wisconsin-Whitewater.....Yes	Abs	
John Carroll.....Yes	Abs		Minnesota Intercollegiate.....			Regis (Massachusetts).....Yes	No		Trinity (Connecticut).....Yes	No		Western Connecticut State.....	No		Wittenberg.....Yes		
John Jay.....Yes	No		Athletic Conf.Yes	No		Rensselaer.....No			Trinity (District of Columbia).....			Western Maryland.....Yes	No		Wooster.....Yes	No	
Johns Hopkins.....Yes	Abs		Mississippi College.....Yes	Abs		Rhode Island College.....Yes	No		Trinity (Texas).....			Western New England.....Yes	No		Worcester Polytechnic.....Yes	No	
Johnson and Wales.....Yes	Yes		Monmouth (Illinois).....			Rhodes.....			Tufts.....Yes			Western Water Polo Assn.			Worcester State.....Yes	Yes	
Johnson State.....			Montclair State.....Yes			Richard Stockton.....Yes			U.S. Coast Guard.....Yes	Abs		Westfield State.....Yes	No		Yeshiva.....Yes	Yes	
Juniata.....			Moravian.....			Ripon.....			U.S. Merchant Marine.....			Westminster (Missouri).....			York (Pennsylvania).....		
Kalamazoo.....Yes	Abs		Mount Holyoke.....Yes	No		Rivier.....Yes	Yes		Union (New York).....Yes	No		Wheaton (Illinois).....Yes	Yes		York (New York).....Yes	No	
Kean.....Yes	Yes		Mount St. Joseph.....			Roanoke.....Yes	No					Wheaton (Massachusetts).....Yes	Yes				
Keene State.....Yes	No		Mount St. Mary (New York).....			Rochester Institute.....											
Kenyon.....Yes			Mount St. Vincent.....			of Technology.....Yes	No										
Keuka.....			Mount Union.....Yes	No		Muhlenberg.....Yes	Yes										
King's (Pennsylvania).....Yes	Yes		Muhlenberg.....Yes	No		Muskingham.....											
Knox.....			Nazareth.....Yes	Yes		Nebraska Wesleyan.....Yes	Abs										
La Roche.....Yes	No		Neumann.....Yes	No		New England College.....											
La Verne.....Yes			New England College.....Yes	Yes		Wrestling Conf.											
Lake Erie.....Yes	No		New England Football Conf.			Russell Sage.....Yes	Abs										
Lake Forest.....Yes	Yes		New England Small College.....			Rust.....Yes	No										
Lake Michigan Conf.			Athletic Conf.			Rutgers-Camden.....											
Lakeland.....			New England.....			Rutgers-Newark.....Yes	No										
Lasell.....			Women's Eight.....Yes	No		Salem State.....No	No										
Lawrence.....			New England.....			Salisbury State.....											
Lebanon Valley.....Yes	Yes		Women's Eight.....Yes	No		Salve Regina.....No	No										
Lehman.....Yes	Abs		New England.....Yes			Savannah A&D.....Yes	Yes										
Lesley.....			New Jersey Athletic Conf.Yes	Yes		Scranton.....											
Lewis and Clark.....			College of New Jersey.....			Shenandoah.....											
Lincoln (Pennsylvania).....			New Paltz State.....Yes	Yes		Simmons.....											
Linfield.....			New Rochelle.....Yes	No		Simpson.....Yes	No										
Little East Conf.Yes	No		New York State Women's.....			Skidmore.....Yes	No										
Loras.....Yes	Abs		Collegiate Athletic Assn.			Skyline Conference.....Yes	Yes										
Luther.....Yes	No		New York University.....Yes	Yes		Smith.....	No										
Lycoming.....			New York, City College.....			Southern California.....											
Lynchburg.....Yes	No		Nichols.....Yes	No		Intercollegiate.....											
Macmurray.....			North Carolina Wesleyan.....			Athletic Conf.Yes	No										
Macalester.....Yes	No		North Central.....Yes	No		Sewanee (University.....											
Maine Maritime.....Yes	Abs		North Coast Athletic Conf.			of the South).....Abs											
Maine-Farmington.....			North Park.....Yes	No		Southern Collegiate.....											
Manchester.....Yes	No		North Collegiate.....			Athletic Conf.Yes	Abs										
Manhattanville.....Yes	Yes		Hockey Assn.			Southern Maine.....Yes	No										
Maranatha Baptist.....			Northern Illinois-Iowa Conf.			Southern Vermont.....Yes	No										
Marian (Wisconsin).....Yes	Yes		Norwich.....Yes	No		Southwestern (Texas).....											
Marietta.....Yes	Abs		Notre Dame (Maryland).....Yes	Yes		Springfield.....Yes	Yes										
Maritime (New York).....Yes	Yes		Oberlin.....			St. Benedict.....Yes	No										
Martin Luther.....			Occidental.....			St. Catherine.....Yes	Yes										
Mary Baldwin.....			Oglethorpe.....			St. Elizabeth.....											
Mary Washington.....Yes	No		Ohio Athletic Conf.Yes	Abs		St. John Fisher.....											
Marymount (Virginia).....			Ohio Northern.....Yes	Abs		St. John's (Minnesota).....No	Abs										
Maryville (Tennessee).....			Ohio Wesleyan.....			St. Joseph (Connecticut).....											
Maryville (Missouri).....Yes																	
Marywood.....Yes	No																

Appendix C

Past Convention Sites

<i>Convention</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>City, Hotel</i>
1st	1906	New York City (Murray Hill)
2nd	1907	New York City (Murray Hill)
3rd	1908	New York City (Murray Hill)
4th	1909	New York City (Murray Hill)
5th	1910	New York City (Astor)
6th	1911	New York City (Astor)
7th	1912	New York City (Astor)
8th	1913	New York City (Astor)
9th	1914	Chicago (LaSalle)
10th	1915	New York City (Astor)
11th	1916	New York City (Astor)
12th	1917	New York City (Astor)
13th	1918	New York City (Astor)
14th	1919	New York City (Astor)
15th	1920	Chicago (Sherman)
16th	1921	New York City (Astor)
17th	1922	New York City (Astor)
18th	1923	Atlanta (Georgian Terrace)
19th	1924	New York City (Astor)
20th	1925	New York City (Astor)
21st	1926	New York City (Astor)
22nd	1927	New York City (Astor)
23rd	1928	New Orleans (Roosevelt)
24th	1929*	New York City (Astor)
25th	1930	New York City (Astor)
26th	1931	New York City (Astor)
27th	1932	New York City (Astor)
28th	1933	Chicago (Stevens)
29th	1934	New York City (Pennsylvania)
30th	1935	New York City (Pennsylvania)
31st	1936	New York City (Pennsylvania)
32nd	1937	New Orleans (St. Charles)
33rd	1938	Chicago (Sherman)
34th	1939	Los Angeles (Biltmore)
35th	1940	New York City (New Yorker)
36th	1941	Detroit (Book-Cadillac)
37th	1942	New York City (Astor)
	1943	No meeting
38th	1944†	New York City (Biltmore)
39th	1945	Columbus, Ohio (Deshler-Wallick)
40th	1946	St. Louis (Jefferson)
41st	1947	New York City (New Yorker)

*Convened January 1, 1930.

†Officers, Executive Committee and chairs of rules committees only.

<i>Convention</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>City, Hotel</i>
42nd	1948	New York City (New Yorker)
43rd	1949	San Francisco (St. Francis)
44th	1950	New York City (Commodore)
45th	1951	Dallas (Adolphus)
46th	1952	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
47th	1953	Washington (Mayflower)
48th	1954	Cincinnati (Netherland Plaza)
49th	1955	New York City (New Yorker)
50th	1956	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
51st	1957	St. Louis (Jefferson)
52nd	1958	Philadelphia (Bellvue Stratford)
53rd	1959	Cincinnati (Netherland Hilton)
54th	1960	New York City (Astor)
55th	1961	Pittsburgh (Penn Sheraton)
56th	1962	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
57th	1963	Los Angeles (Statler Hilton)
58th	1964	New York City (Commodore)
59th	1965	Chicago (Conrad Hilton)
60th	1966	Washington (Sheraton Park)
61st	1967	Houston (Sheraton Lincoln)
62nd	1968	New York City (Biltmore)
63rd	1969	Los Angeles (Hilton)
64th	1970	Washington (Statler Hilton)
65th	1971	Houston (Astroworld)
66th	1972	Hollywood, Florida (Diplomat)
67th	1973	Chicago (Palmer House)
1st Special	1973	Chicago (Regency Hyatt House)
68th	1974	San Francisco (St. Francis)
69th	1975	Washington (Sheraton-Park)
2nd Special	1975	Chicago (Palmer House)
3rd Special	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
70th	1976	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront Inn)
71st	1977	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau)
72nd	1978	Atlanta (Peachtree Plaza)
73rd	1979	San Francisco (St. Francis)
74th	1980	New Orleans (Fairmont)
75th	1981	Miami Beach (Fontainebleau Hilton)
4th Special	1981	St. Louis (Stouffer's Riverfront)
76th	1982	Houston (Hyatt Regency)
77th	1983	San Diego (Town and Country)
78th	1984	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
79th	1985	Nashville (Opryland)
5th Special	1985	New Orleans (Hyatt Regency)
80th	1986	New Orleans (Hilton Riverside)
81st	1987	San Diego (Town and Country)
6th Special	1987	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
82nd	1988	Nashville (Opryland)
83rd	1989	San Francisco (Hilton)
84th	1990	Dallas (Loews Anatole)
85th	1991	Nashville (Opryland)
86th	1992	Anaheim (Hilton and Towers)
87th	1993	Dallas (Loews Anatole)

<i>Convention</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>City, Hotel</i>
88th	1994	San Antonio (Marriott Rivercenter)
89th	1995	San Diego (Marriott Marina)
90th	1996	Dallas (Wyndham Anatole)
91st	1997	Nashville (Opryland)

Appendix D

NCAA Officers, 1906-1997

Years *Name, Institution*

President

- 1906-1913—Capt. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1914-1916—LeBaron R. Briggs, Harvard University
 1917-1929—Brig. Gen. Palmer E. Pierce, U.S. Military Academy
 1930-1932—Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University
 1933-1937—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1938-1940—William B. Owens, Stanford University
 1941-1944—Phillip O. Badger, New York University
 1945-1946—Wilbur C. Smith, Tulane University, University of Wyoming
 1947-1949—Karl E. Lieb, University of Iowa
 1950-1952—Hugh C. Willett, University of Southern California
 1953-1954—Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa
 1955-1956—Clarence P. Houston, Tufts University
 1957-1958—Frank N. Gardner, Drake University
 1959-1960—Herbert J. Dorricott, Western State College of Colorado
 1961-1962—Henry B. Hardt, Texas Christian University
 1963-1964—Robert F. Ray, University of Iowa
 1965-1966—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1967-1968—Marcus L. Plant, University of Michigan
 1969-1970—Harry M. Cross, University of Washington
 1971-1972—Earl M. Ramer, University of Tennessee, Knoxville
 1973-1974—Alan J. Chapman, Rice University
 1975-1976—John A. Fuzak, Michigan State University
 1977-1978—J. Neils Thompson, University of Texas at Austin
 1979-1980—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1981-1982—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1983-1984—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1985-1986—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1987-1988—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1989-1990—Albert M.F. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1991-1992—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1993-1995—Joseph N. Crowley, University of Nevada
 1995-1997—Eugene F. Corrigan, Atlantic Coast Conference

Secretary-Treasurer

- 1906-1908—Louis A. Bevier Jr., Rutgers University, New Brunswick
 1908 —William A. Lambeth, University of Virginia (Treasurer only)
 1909-1939—Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University
 1940-1944—Maj. John L. Griffith, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1945-1951—Kenneth L. Wilson, Intercollegiate Conference (Big Ten)
 1952-1954—Earl S. Fullbrook, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

1955-1956—Ralph W. Aigler, University of Michigan
 1957-1958—Edwin D. Mouzon Jr., Southern Methodist University
 1959-1960—Gen. Percy L. Sadler, Lehigh University
 1961-1962—Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, Santa Clara University
 1963-1964—Everett D. Barnes, Colgate University
 1965-1966—Francis E. Smiley, Colorado School of Mines
 1967-1968—Ernest B. McCoy, Pennsylvania State University
 1969-1970—William J. Flynn, Boston College
 1971-1972—Samuel E. Barnes, Howard University, University of
 District of Columbia
 1973-1974—Richard P. Koenig, Valparaiso University
 1975-1976—Stanley J. Marshall, South Dakota State University
 1977-1978—Edgar A. Sherman, Muskingum College
 1979-1980—James Frank, Lincoln University (Missouri)
 1981-1982—John L. Toner, University of Connecticut
 1983-1984—John R. Davis, Oregon State University
 1985-1986—Wilford S. Bailey, Auburn University
 1987-1988—Thomas J. Frericks, University of Dayton
 1989-1990—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1991-1992—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1993—Cedric W. Dempsey, University of Arizona
 1994—Prentice Gautt, Big Eight Conference
 1995-1997—Phyllis L. Howlett, Big Ten Conference

Division I Vice-President

1983-1984—Gwendolyn Norrell, Michigan State University
 1985—Arliss L. Roaden, Tennessee Technological University
 1986—Lewis A. Cryer, Pacific Coast Athletic Association
 1987-1988—Albert M.F. Witte, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
 1989-1990—B. J. Skelton, Clemson University
 1991—Douglas S. Hobbs, University of California, Los
 Angeles
 1992-1993—R. Elaine Dreidame, University of Dayton
 1994-1995—William M. Sangster, Georgia Institute of Technology
 1996-1997—Robert M. Sweazy, Texas Tech University

Division II Vice-President

1983—Edwin W. Lawrence, University of Alaska Fairbanks
 1984-1985—Ade L. Sponberg, North Dakota State University
 1986—Asa N. Green, Livingston University
 1987-1988—Howard Elwell, Gannon University
 1989-1990—Jerry M. Hughes, Central Missouri State University
 1991-1992—Anthony F. Ceddia, Shippensburg University of
 Pennsylvania
 1993-1994—Charles N. Lindemann, Humboldt State University
 1995-1997—Lynn L. Dorn, North Dakota State University

Division III Vice-President

1983—Kenneth J. Weller, Central College (Iowa)
 1984-1985—Elizabeth A. Kruczek, Fitchburg State College
 1986-1987—Judith M. Sweet, University of California, San Diego
 1988-1989—Alvin J. Van Wie, College of Wooster
 1990-1991—Rocco J. Carzo, Tufts University
 1992-1993—John H. Harvey, Carnegie Mellon University

1994-1995—Edward G. Coll Jr., Alfred University
 1996-1997—Bridget Belgiovine, University of Wisconsin, La Crosse

NCAA Officers, 1997-

Executive Committee Chair

1997- —Samuel H. Smith, Washington State University

Division I Board of Directors Chair

1997- —Kenneth A. Shaw, Syracuse University

Division II Presidents Council Chair

1997- —Adam W. Herbert, University of North Florida

Division III Presidents Council Chair

1997- —Curtis L. McCray, Millikin University



THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
